

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. I now move that the resolution be amended by adding at the end thereof the following language, which I ask the clerk to report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Add at the end of the resolution the following:

The commission is hereby further directed to report particularly whether any of the practices heretofore in this resolution stated tend to create a monopoly or constitute a violation of the Federal antitrust laws.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment at the end of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the paragraph just agreed to insert the following:

The Senate shall proceed, within 10 days after the passage of this resolution, to select an attorney to present and develop all facts before the commission connected with this investigation, and the attorney shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate an amount fixed by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I very much hope that the amendment will not be agreed to. I can not approve of the Senate of the United States employing lawyers to present a case of that character. The Federal Trade Commission are amply supplied with lawyers to look after matters imposed upon them and committed to their keeping. I see no necessity for the adoption of this particular amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I think the only thing necessary to complete the work that has just been done would be to remove absolutely any possibility of a real investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, since the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] has made the statement about the amendment I desire to state this fact: As I understand it, this is not a regular court proceeding. If there is not some method of presenting the evidence there will be no evidence before the commission. There must be some one charged with that duty; that is, if it is really intended to have an investigation. Of course, if no investigation is desired, the amendment should be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, in view of the adoption of the main amendment presented by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I for one am unwilling that the Senate shall have anything whatsoever to do with this so-called investigation, and I shall vote against the amendment presented by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I hope my colleague's amendment will be adopted. I think it would be a good thing to select some bright and trustworthy attorney to present such facts as he may be in possession of to the commission.

The Senate has employed attorneys to represent the Government in the cases of Sinclair and Doheney and Fall. What harm could come in this instance from having some competent attorney present any facts that he may find? No harm could come from that.

I for one, for reasons entirely satisfactory to me, voted in favor of the amendment to have the Federal Trade Commission conduct the investigation of the utility companies, but I should like to see some good lawyer given the opportunity to aid and assist in any way that he possibly could. If the commission should fail or refuse to do anything, the Senate will take the proper steps to see that an investigation is had. We are not tied up by this proceeding. We have not surrendered any right that we have. The Senator from Montana suggested that the companies might take an appeal from the Trade Commission on the ground that it had no authority and thus would hold up the matter in the courts. If any such proceeding is started looking to delay or to preventing an investigation, I shall move that the Senate itself shall proceed to the investigation after the two national conventions shall have met and adjourned.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, do I understand the amendment directs the Senate to employ the counsel and that he shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate?

Mr. BLACK. The amendment is designed to provide for the employment of an attorney.

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me that if the commission is competent to make the investigation it certainly ought to be

competent to select counsel. The Senate has decided that it is competent to make the investigation, and it does seem to me to be making a reflection on them to say that they have not sense enough to select such counsel as they may need.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby directed to inquire into and report to the Senate, by filing with the Secretary thereof, within each 30 days after the passage of this resolution and finally on the completion of the investigation (any such inquiry before the commission to be open to the public and due notice of the time and place of all hearings to be given by the commission, and the stenographic report of the evidence taken by the commission to accompany the partial and final reports) upon: (1) The growth of the capital assets and capital liabilities of public utility corporations doing an interstate or international business supplying either electrical energy in the form of power or light or both, however produced, or gas, natural or artificial, of corporations holding the stocks of two or more public-utility corporations operating in different States, and of nonpublic-utility corporations owned or controlled by such holding companies; (2) the method of issuing, the price realized or value received, the commissions or bonuses paid or received, and other pertinent facts with respect to the various security issues of all classes of corporations herein named, including the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness thereof, as well as the stocks of the same; (3) the extent to which such holding companies or their stockholders control or are financially interested in financial, engineering, construction, and/or management corporations, and the relation, one to the other, of the classes of corporations last named, the holding companies, and the public-utility corporations; (4) the services furnished to such public-utility corporations by such holding companies and/or their associated, affiliated, and/or subsidiary companies, the fees, commissions, bonuses, or other charges made therefor, and the earnings and expenses of such holding companies and their associated, affiliated, and/or subsidiary companies; and (5) the value or detriment to the public of such holding companies owning the stock or otherwise controlling such public-utility corporations immediately or remotely, with the extent of such ownership or control, and particularly what legislation, if any, should be enacted by Congress to correct any abuses that may exist in the organization or operation of such holding companies.

The commission is further empowered to inquire and report whether, and to what extent, such corporations or any of the officers thereof or any one in their behalf or in behalf of any organization of which any such corporation may be a member, through the expenditure of money or through the control of the avenues of publicity, have made any and what effort to influence or control public opinion on account of municipal or public ownership of the means by which power is developed and electrical energy is generated and distributed, or since 1923 to influence or control elections: *Provided*, That the elections herein referred to shall be limited to the elections of President, Vice President, and Members of the United States Senate.

The commission is hereby further directed to report particularly whether any of the practices heretofore in this resolution stated tend to create a monopoly, or constitute violation of the Federal antitrust laws.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 16, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, February 15, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Hear us, O Lord of the vineyard. Thou dost still send us forth to the fields of service. As each has his own task, may he achieve Thy good pleasure by a thorough devotion to duty. Helpfulness enters into the fundamental conception of our living. The praise of life is that man exhales bounty and stimulus and encouragement as he journeys on. Keep us clear of any just accusation that we have done any evil thing. Permit us to work with Thee in the service of our country, in the growth of Christian idealism, and in bringing heaven and earth nearer together. Rebuke our ease, smite our selfishness, and lead us on toward that realm where all night is past and the day has dawned. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9186. An act authorizing the Sistersville Ohio River Bridge Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.; and

H. R. 9660. An act authorizing the city of Louisville, Ky., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near said city.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7009) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes."

#### DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may file minority views on the bill H. R. 10078, a deportation bill from the Committee on Immigration, within five days.

Mr. TILSON. Let the Clerk report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10078) providing for the deportation of certain aliens, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to file minority views on the bill H. R. 10078 within five days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADDRESS OF HON. LORING M. BLACK, JR.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a speech delivered by my colleague [Mr. BLACK] on the retirement of Admiral Plunkett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following speech of Hon. LORING M. BLACK, JR., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, at a dinner to Admiral Charles P. Plunkett, tendered by the civilian employees of the New York Navy Yard on February 13, 1928:

Mr. BLACK. Admiral Plunkett recently ventilated the subject of an Anglo-American war with a rather startling journalistic and official repercussion to himself. Such a conflict has long been whispered about in British and American naval and diplomatic circles. Our admiral succeeded in drawing it into the open and such open discussion should be healthy rather than hurtful.

On this question there are two main American theses: First, no American wants war with Great Britain; second, in the event of such a war, no American wants the United States to be unprepared.

There are some who believe that a conflict between the United States and the British Empire is unthinkable, but, as Mr. Storm Jameson said in the February English Review of 1921, "It is easy to declare roundly that a war between this country and America is unthinkable. That statement argues nothing so much as an imaginative incapacity on the part of the sentimentalists who make it." No less a student of international affairs than President Wilson has said that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry.

We have reached a stage of tremendous economic rivalry with Great Britain, and in 1926 we led Great Britain in the ratio of 91 to 85 in the relative value of foreign trade. Great Britain has long been accustomed to the position of the great economic and maritime leader of the world. In our coastwise trade alone we equal the entire foreign trade of Great Britain. Tradition has given to the leading economic factor the supremacy on the high seas. When we agree with Great Britain that there should be a parity of naval strength, we are making a great concession, for were we to have a Navy commensurate with our economic position as fixed by precedent, which precedent was made by Great Britain, we would have a Navy far surpassing the British.

The American idealists on the subject of the high-mindedness of foreign diplomacy have suffered some rude jolts. They are beginning to realize that peace treaties of foreign powers arise from desires toward increasing national prestige rather than being motivated by a hope of world peace. No better example of this has been offered than the fate of the Washington Disarmament Conference. We had among our delegates some very practical gentlemen who were carried away with the postwar idealism and who were, therefore, out-manuevered in the Washington conference war game by that ghostly diplomatic cat, Lord Balfour. Of him, Mr. A. G. Gardner, editor of the London News,

has said "You feel that he would give you the same smile in sending you to the scaffold as he would in passing you the salt." At his door can be laid much responsibility for the present war talk and practically all responsibility for the naval-armament race which is now being run. He was crafty enough to leave Great Britain free to regain its relative naval strength by consenting to the scrapping of our new battleship construction and Great Britain's inferior ships of that type, having in mind that Great Britain could and would build a powerful instrument of war in the 10,000-ton cruiser. Mr. Gardner also said of Balfour that his "domination of the Washington conference made a deep and lasting impression on America of British statesmanship at its highest point." His mastery over the conference was not for the purpose of stopping armament competition but merely to bring down the then supremacy of America. He left the door open, and he repeatedly has said so, for the construction of the 10,000-ton cruiser which Mr. Hector Bywater describes as "in fighting value they are but little inferior to the treaty type, which they might engage without undue risk. As regards protection they are probably superior."

Great Britain has attempted to blame Japan for violating the spirit of the Washington treaty but in Lord Balfour's mind in Washington was worked out the idea of the present race.

It has always been my contention and stated on the floor of Congress that when Great Britain started her cruiser program and Japan her cruiser and submarine program that our State Department should have protested on the theory that the spirit of the treaty was being violated. Had such a protest been lodged, an exchange of notes should have brought us back to the ratio and would have accomplished much more than the ill-fated Geneva Conference.

Admiral Plunkett is not to blame for war talk, but responsibility is squarely up to Lord Balfour, who used a peace movement as a war weapon.

Speaking of the Geneva conference, President Coolidge, in his message to Congress, said, "We were granted much cooperation by Japan, but we were unable to come to an agreement with Great Britain."

This is a much terser and fully as pregnant statement of a possibility of conflict with Great Britain than any of the speeches of our admiral. This was followed up by the President in his submission to Congress of the Navy building program sent to the House by the Secretary of the Navy.

It seems to me that Congress might well follow the department on this matter. The program is generally misunderstood. Congress can not appropriate for the Navy year by year unless there is legislation passed by Congress prior to the appropriations authorizing the expenditure of the money for certain purposes. The proposal of the department was for the time being only to have Congress authorize subsequent Congresses to appropriate the money needed to carry out a naval policy.

As far as cruisers are concerned, if the department policy is adopted, the British will reach the 400,000-ton quota which we submitted at Geneva five years in advance of us on the basis of their existing approved program. I say to those Americans who have such great faith in Great Britain, that they consider what the British Admiralty deem necessary for the protection of British trade and then see if they can not conclude that our Navy is justified in asking just as much protection at least for a greater trade—the trade of the United States.

The British Admiralty believes it requires 600,000 tons of cruiser construction. President Coolidge tells us "we have a foreign commerce and ocean lines of trade unsurpassed by any other country." If the British Admiralty is right about what Great Britain needs in cruisers for its trade, surely our Naval Department is entirely too modest in its request of Congress for cruiser protection for our trade. Of course, the American who worries about the safety of Great Britain will tell us that the British need cruisers to protect trade within far-flung possessions, but the British understand that this immense cruiser fleet is not for the purpose of convoy but for the purpose of blockading and starving into submission a hostile nation. This purpose would naturally interfere with our trade should we care to have commercial intercourse with the power at war with Great Britain.

To those who believe that a great fleet means war, let us say that war logically proceeds from a stronger against a weaker power and if we are impressed with American ideals of peace, we can feel sure that we will not, as a stronger power, wage war and quite logically, a weaker power is not liable to make war on us. A strong fleet is a mighty help toward peace; as Lord Nelson said, "There is no better a negotiator in the councils of Europe than a fleet of English battleships."

It might be well to consider what Japan is doing. The Japanese Advertiser on October 8 said that Japan will be equipped, under its reorganization of the navy, with the most powerful navy she has ever possessed. The naval strategists do not always agree with the pacifists that at the time of war talk there will be war, for, as Commander Matsunaga, of the Japanese naval ministry says, "the Japanese Navy makes it a point to begin action at a time when it is thought practically impossible." Our trade on the Pacific and insular relations require that we at least maintain the ratio of 5 to 3 with Japan, as established at the Washington conference. Mr. Hector Bywater tells us that with few modern



cruisers now at its disposal the American Navy could do practically nothing to secure the safety of trade routes in war.

In the absence of swift cruisers to hold hostile raiders in check the American merchant marine would, in all likelihood, be swept from the sea. The prime obligation on Congress under the Constitution is to provide for the common defense; and indeed the prime purpose of the Constitution was to organize the States into a unit for defensive purposes and foreign intercourse. Congress should pay heed to those experts of the Navy, such as Admiral Plunkett, who has for years been building up the American Navy with an eye to the construction work of possible aggressors.

There are those who believe that the money spent on warships could be better spent in the agricultural fields and otherwise; but the mere building of naval crafts is a peace-time contribution to the general good in relieving unemployment conditions. We had about 2,000,000 less employed in 1927 than we had in 1923. This is a serious condition. We have the private shipyards of the country going out of business and navy yards stagnating. We have American trade carried in foreign bottoms.

America has become a great economic factor and should take a reckoning of its power on the sea and start to build. This would help our shippers, our great industrial yards, and American skilled labor.

Should war ever unfortunately come to this country, it is better that it should come when we are ready to protect American interests. Admiral Plunkett has done a tremendous service to peace and preparedness by his honest indication of realities on the high seas.

I hope the country, on his retirement, will not lose his tremendous energy, brilliant mind, and honest heart. I trust that America will decide to build itself up as a maritime power. If those concerned have any vision, they will look to our admiral as a great leader in such a movement.

#### MEETING OF COMMITTEE OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute on a matter of the committee meeting of the World War veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. On Tuesday next there will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the World War Veterans' Committee on insurance at 10 o'clock a. m., at which time we would like to have Members of the House who are interested present their views on the continuance of the World War veterans' insurance.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing an article on flood control.

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, how long is it?

Mr. QUIN. It is a pretty lengthy article.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I object.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

#### MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT AND THE PUEBLO INDIANS

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, for a little time I want to bring to the attention of the House the bill (S. 700) which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to execute an agreement with the Middle Rio Grande conservancy district, for irrigation, drainage, and flood control for certain Pueblo Indian lands in New Mexico.

The bill passed the Senate, came to the House, passed the House the other day by unanimous consent, certain amendments which I offered being accepted. It has gone to the Senate, and there has been referred back to the Indian Affairs Committee, and its progress halted.

This is a highly important bill, and the action that has been taken is the result of unfair lobbying and has in it possibilities of great loss for the Indians as well as for the people of New Mexico. The situation that has arisen carries with it also this important question, that is broader than this bill—whether through misrepresentation, falsehood, and threats Congress can be diverted from doing that which ought to be done, with the result that nothing is done, or possibly something done that ought not to be done.

#### UNDESIRABLE LOBBYING

One John Collier, executive secretary of the Indian Defense Association (Inc.), with whose work I have had a great deal of contact, is responsible for this delay and threatened defeat of the bill. And I say, measuring my words, from knowledge of his methods and his accomplishments, that he is an insincere, unworthy, unreliable, misrepresenting, destructive lobbyist. He goes about peddling misinformation and threats with equal

facility and irresponsibility, never constructive, but always destructive.

As when defending Sacco and Vanzetti, so he is at all times sure his Government is wrong. He is creating and preserving for himself a job and wasting the fine enthusiasm and altruistic motives of many fine people who are, through misunderstanding, led into his organization and who might, with honest leadership, do a great constructive work.

About this bill he has said in a circular letter which attacks me but was not sent me by him but has been peddled by him where he thought most desirable:

There are six Pueblo tribes involved in this bill. Three of these—namely, the tribes, Cochiti, San Domingo, San Felipe—do not possess sufficient cultivated land to make a decent living. Under the bill with the Cramton amendment these three tribes will be strangled.

Virtually though not technically confiscating these newly reclaimed acres, debarring the Indians from expanding their agriculture on to these newly reclaimed acres, and gravely handicapping the Indians in any effort to lease these newly reclaimed acres.

The Pueblo tribes having been used up to a certain point are simply ditched and are wound up in a paralyzing hopeless rope of unjust debt.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### SHALL HALF A MILLION DOLLARS BE A GIFT?

Mr. CRAMTON. The difference of opinion arises as to whether the million and a half dollars which is proposed to be appropriated for the benefit of those Indians is all, at some vague and indefinite time in the future, to be reimbursed to the Treasury, or whether we shall advance a million and a half dollars without interest, waiting 40 or 50 years for its return, and then make them a present of one-third of it—a half million dollars.

He charges that an agreement with the conservancy district, with the Indian Bureau, or others has been violated. Even he, with his loose handling of the truth, dares not say that I was a party to any agreement to give the Pueblos a half million, or that my committee made any such promise, or that Congress was ever a party to any such agreement. Has the time come when lobbyists can extort an agreement from a municipal project and hold Congress bound by it? Or can even a bureau of the Government commit Congress to a gift of half a million dollars from the Treasury?

This project means much to the middle Rio Grande Valley of New Mexico, and is not possible without Government co-operation on behalf of the Indians. The pestiferous force of the pernicious lobbying activities of Collier are no doubt known in New Mexico, where he has been active. Naturally they would consent to any reimbursement terms for the Indian lands that the Government sees fit to impose. That is between the Indians and the Government and does not affect the district, so long as the Indian lands come in. And the gentlemen who have been promoting the project here in a most honorable, very able, and entirely commendable way are not responsible for the so-called Cramton amendments.

Neither is the Indian Bureau responsible. They have advised the gift.

I accept my share of responsibility, acting in sincere performance of my official duty. Bound by no promise or commitment to the contrary, actuated by no selfish interest, and quite familiar with the proposition through hearings and study and several visits to the locality involved, I have proposed amendments which have met with general favor in this House, and I was assured would be accepted at the other end of the Capitol.

What has been the showing to Congress? In the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee holding hearings on the second deficiency appropriation bill last year, on the initial appropriation for reconnaissance work, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] asked this question:

If an appropriation were made, would the money come out of the tribal fund or out of the General Treasury?

To which the reply was made by Mr. Rodey, who was the representative of the conservancy district:

It would be chargeable to the tribal funds.

There was nothing there about any gift of a half million dollars.

My own subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation bill visited the section last October, and we held extensive hearings in December, to the extent of 50 pages of the hearings on the Interior appropriation bill, and those hearings developed this difference of opinion with the Indian Bureau as to the policy to be followed. All my associates on that subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation

bill—Messrs. MURPHY, FRENCH, TAYLOR, and HASTINGS—held the view that I held, that we would be doing sufficient if we advanced the money without interest for their benefit, and that it all should be returned. I went before the Committee on Indian Affairs and expressed those views, and several members of that committee have indorsed my view. When the amendment went through the House several members of that committee, including the chairman, Mr. LEAVITT, were on the floor, and all were thoroughly cognizant of what was being done. There was no objection made at that time.

#### THE BILL AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

I shall insert at this point, under the permission given me, a copy of the bill, and it will show the bill as it was passed by the Senate and as it came to the House. There is inclosed in black brackets those parts that were crossed out by my amendment, and in italics will appear the language that I inserted. The full scope of my amendments then appears:

[S. 700, Seventieth Congress, first session]

A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to execute an agreement with the Middle Rio Grande conservancy district, providing for conservation, irrigation, drainage, and flood control for the Pueblo Indian lands in the Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex., and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the Middle Rio Grande conservancy district, a political subdivision of the State of New Mexico, providing for conservation, irrigation, drainage, and flood control for the Pueblo Indian lands situated within the exterior boundaries of the said Middle Rio Grande conservancy district, as provided for by plans prepared for this purpose in pursuance to an act of February 14, 1927 (44 Stat. L. 1098). The construction cost of such conservation, irrigation, drainage, and flood-control work apportioned to the Indian lands as shall not exceed \$1,593,311, and [that] said sum, or so much thereof as may be required to pay the Indians' share of the cost of the work herein provided for, shall be payable in not less than five installments without interest, which installments shall be paid annually as work progresses, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1,593,311, of which amount \$100,000 is hereby made immediately available for the payment of the first installment: *Provided*, That should at any time it appear to the said Secretary that construction work is not being carried out in accordance with plans approved by him, he shall withhold payment of any sums that may under the agreement be due the conservancy district until such work shall have been done in accordance with the said plans: *Provided further*, That in determining the share of the cost of the works to be apportioned to the Indian lands there shall be taken into consideration [any] only [allowances determined by the Secretary of the Interior as properly deductible, and] the [total] Indian acreage benefited which shall be definitely determined by said Secretary and such acreage include only lands feasibly susceptible of economic irrigation and cultivation, and materially benefited by this work and in no event shall the average per acre cost for the area of Indian lands benefited exceed \$67.50: *Provided further*, That all present water rights now appurtenant to approximately 8,346 acres of irrigated Pueblo lands owned individually or as pueblos under the proposed plans of the district, and all water for the domestic purposes of the Indians and for their stock shall be prior and paramount to any rights of the district or any property holder therein, which priority so defined shall be recognized and protected in the agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the said Middle Rio Grande conservancy district, and the water rights for newly reclaimed lands shall be recognized as equal to those of like district lands and be protected from discrimination in the division and use of water, and such water rights, old as well as new, shall not be subject to loss by nonuse or abandonment thereof so long as title to said lands shall remain in the Indians individually or as pueblos or in the United States, and such irrigated area of approximately 8,346 acres shall not be [subjected directly or indirectly to the reimbursable features of this act, nor shall it be] subject by the district or otherwise to any pro rata share of future operation and maintenance or betterment work performed by the district. [Subject to the foregoing exception the remainder of the] The share of the cost paid the district on behalf of the Indian lands under the agreement herein authorized, including any sum paid to the district from the funds authorized to be appropriated by the act of February 14, 1927 (44 Stat. L. 1098), shall be reimbursed to the United States [in accordance with the benefits derived, but in no event to exceed the limitation of cost herein fixed,] under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That such reimbursement shall be made only from leases or proceeds from the newly reclaimed Pueblo lands [in not less than 40 annual payments], and there is hereby created against such newly reclaimed lands a first lien, which lien shall not be enforced during the period that the title to such lands remains in the pueblos or individual Indian ownership: *Provided further*, That said Secretary of the Interior, through the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, or his duly

authorized agent, shall be recognized by said district in all matters pertaining to its operation in the same ratio that the Indian lands bear to the total area of lands within the district, and that the district books and records shall be available at all times for inspection by said representative.

#### WHAT THE BILL DOES

What does the bill do? I say that John Collier or anyone else takes upon himself a tremendously heavy responsibility when he endangers the final enactment into law of so important and desirable a measure as this. That is particularly so upon the part of anyone who presumes to speak for the interest of the Indians, because they are benefited above all others.

This proposed conservancy district stretches for 150 miles along the Rio Grande River, above and below Albuquerque. It is only 3 or 4 miles wide. The Rio Grande River through the years has built itself up with a deposit of silt, so that drainage is about impossible for those lands adjacent to the river, so that whether they are Indian lands or white lands there are many acres that used to be cultivated that can not now be cultivated, because they have become water-logged and sour and filled with alkali. Nature knows no difference between white lands and Indian lands.

It is the purpose of this bill to afford drainage, flood protection, and water for irrigation for this long and narrow stretch of land. It can only be done by united action of the whole area. It is the purpose to afford drainage and remove the alkali, afford a sure and ample water supply for irrigation, and make these acres available for use and fully productive. Whether they are Indian lands or whether they are white lands, they are not used as much as formerly and can not be. There are 8,000 acres, approximately, of Indian lands that are subject to some cultivation, and credits have been allowed them for certain structures. These lands need this project.

The bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior must find that the acreage "is feasibly susceptible of economic irrigation and cultivation" before it is brought into the district.

But, furthermore, and this is of special importance as to the 8,000 acres, which Collier says have been "irrigated since before the time of Christ in a highly efficient way," my amendment inserted the further requirement that the Secretary find, before including them, that the land is "materially benefited by this work." If they are materially benefited, and they are, even the 8,000 acres, why should the Indians not repay sometime the cost of the work?

Here is what the bill, as amended, does to these Indians who are being "strangled" we are told:

First, as to the 8,000 acres that now have some partial use, they are given a priority of water right as against all other lands, including other lands in the district. To-day they have no such guaranteed priority. The bill reads:

*Provided further*, That all present water rights now appurtenant to approximately 8,346 acres of irrigated Pueblo lands owned individually or as pueblos under the proposed plans of the district, and all water for the domestic purposes of the Indians and for their stock shall be prior and paramount to any rights of the district or any property holder therein, which priority so defined shall be recognized and protected in the agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the said middle Rio Grande conservancy district.

Next, as to the other 15,000 acres of land that are not now used, but which are to be reclaimed by this bill, they are given an equal priority with other lands in the district, forever, while in Indian ownership, whether used or not, and the water rights for newly reclaimed lands shall be recognized as equal to those of like district lands and be protected from discrimination in the division and use of water, and such water rights, old as well as new, shall not be subject to loss by nonuse or abandonment thereof so long as title to said lands shall remain in the Indians individually or as pueblos or the United States. There is a great advantage and a great protection to the Indians. If it were possible to organize this district without those Indian lands, the water would be taken and those 15,000 acres would be forever useless. But under the bill, whether the water is used or not, the Indians are assured it is there when they want it.

They have some use of the 8,000 acres, but under this bill, with these improvements, their beneficial use of these lands will be doubled, if not quadrupled, over what it is to-day; and nothing from the proceeds of those lands is taken, and no lien is to rest upon them. We furnish the \$67.50 per acre; we charge it to them on the books, but we take our chance of getting it by improving the lands now entirely unimproved.

As to the 15,000 acres not now used, we are going to make those valuable—worth from \$100 to \$200 per acre. In fact,



since they pay no interest on what we loan to them, the Indians and their advisors should look ahead 25 or 50 years to see what those lands will be worth to these Indians in the future. Those Indians will increase in population. They are now starting out on new lines of progress. Very soon they are going to need those 15,000 acres. Under Mr. Collier's own statement, which I quoted, they need some of them now; but they are useless to-day. This project will make them productive, drained, and with full water right.

#### GENEROUS TREATMENT OF THE INDIANS

What do the Indians pay? They get their priority established. Their lands—8,000 acres—are made much more productive. The 15,000 acres for the first time will have a value. What do we ask them to do that we are "confiscating" their lands?

The whites must not only pay the money invested but must pay interest; the Indians pay no interest.

The whites will pay \$76 an acre; the Indians \$67.50.

The whites must pay their debt in 40 years, and their taxes and interest charges besides. The Indians pay no taxes and no interest and are not likely to pay it in 40 years.

The whites pay operation and maintenance cost not only on their lands but on these 8,000 acres of Indian land perpetually. Perpetually is a long, long time; but forever, under the terms of this bill, the Indians are exempt from any charge for operation or maintenance or betterment work done by the district for the 8,000 acres. The little side ditches the Indians will take care of themselves, but the main canals are forever maintained by the whites without any charge to the Indians. The bill reads:

and such irrigated area of approximately 8,346 acres shall not be subject by the district or otherwise to any pro rata share of future operation and maintenance or betterment work performed by the district.

Then consider in the course of time what that is worth to the Indians. Still we are told that Congress is trying to confiscate the lands of the Indians.

The Indians pay nothing from their pockets or from the proceeds from the 8,000 acres. What do they pay? We have confidence enough in the success of the project and what it will do with that 15,000 acres not now used at all that we will take our chances on the success of the project, and the bill does not ask interest but just the principal to reclaim and improve the 23,000 acres and takes it only from the rentals that the Indians secure from the 15,000 acres. The bill reads, as amended:

The share of the cost paid the district on behalf of the Indian lands under the agreement herein authorized, including any sum paid to the district from the fund authorized to be appropriated by the act of February 14, 1927 (44 Stat. 1098), shall be reimbursed to the United States under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That such reimbursement shall be made only from leases or proceeds from the newly reclaimed Pueblo lands, and there is hereby created against such newly reclaimed lands a first lien, which lien shall not be enforced during the period that the title to such lands remains in the pueblos or individual Indian ownership.

This contemplates that the lands reclaimed, which are in communal ownership, will be leased to individual Indians or to whites, Indians, of course, being given the preference. In either case a rental will be asked based on such rentals on similar lands in the valley. The rentals from such leases, whether Indian or white, will be applied to the debt until it is paid and thereafter will go to the pueblo. The Indians will have at hand new areas of desirable land and have no excessive charges to pay for lands now valueless. There is no hardship here. I would prefer "proceeds from leases of newly reclaimed pueblo lands" as clearer, but no doubt the language used means the same.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. I repeat, there is no hardship there. If the project is not successful, nothing will come back to the Treasury. But if it is successful, as I believe it will be, there will be 15,000 acres made productive that are not now productive, and the proceeds of leases of that 15,000 acres now unused we will take to repay what we furnished them.

#### GUARANTEES THE FUTURE OF THESE PUEBLOS

This bill guarantees the future prosperity of the Pueblos involved. It is fair. It is generous. And if these organizations, such as that led by John Collier, would be constructive, they would be here trying to put it through Congress instead of

obstructing its passage. It is not an easy thing to get \$1,500,000 from Congress, and this means much to the Indians, much to New Mexico. I have been doing all I could to get this bill through.

There is no gain for the Indian in teaching him to be a mendicant or to expect gifts from the Government. The day of rations proved the insanity of that policy, and we have abandoned it. We ought now to follow the policy of giving the Indian help to help himself. That is what he wants above all else. What this bill does is to help the Indian to help himself. It would be law now except for the misrepresentations and the threats of John Collier. [Applause.]

#### NAVAL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] is recognized.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting a tabulation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there are two distinct classes of citizens in this Nation: Those that can see a war cloud in the middle of every sunshiny day and who continuously try to take advantage of every opportunity to involve this country in great expenditures for the kind of preparedness that is believed by many to be useless in time of war; and secondly, the class who take into consideration the economic and financial conditions of this country and the various nations of the world, keeping in mind that the ultimate object of all of the best citizens should be the maintenance of peace with other nations, also keeping in mind that should the Nation be so unfortunate as to become involved in a war that the kind of preparedness we should have would be the newer, more modern kinds of defense that any nation will need to be victorious.

Within the last 48 hours a perfect barrage of propaganda has been given to the citizens of this country in favor of a war program. Monday, Secretary Wilbur started the fireworks at Indianapolis; Tuesday, the press quoted the President of the United States as favoring the construction of this program, but leaving the impression that he would be satisfied with 25 cruisers; and this morning the distinguished gentleman from Illinois gives notice that he has flopped over and again joined the administration in promoting certain features of the proposed legislation, which, according to the figures just presented to the Naval Affairs Committee, covering a five-year program to be completed in nine years, amounts to the enormous sum of \$4,176,426,000.

Secretary Wilbur, in his speech made at Indianapolis on Monday, assailed the critics of the administration in support of what he claimed was a program amounting to \$740,000,000, which is a sum far less than the actual figures shown in this connection, for the reason this amount does not include the following: \$96,650,000 allocated for the building of submarines and cruisers already authorized; \$170,070,000 for the five-year aviation program; \$76,970,000 for cruisers now being constructed and authorized in the 1928 program; and approximately \$540,000,000 for increased personnel and expenses in connection with the proposed new ships. This sum, added to the estimated cost necessary for the upkeep of the Navy and the proposed reconditioning of certain battleships, brings the cost up to more than \$4,000,000,000 to be expended during the nine-year period.

Secretary Wilbur, in his Indianapolis speech, complains about those who want the Navy to fight blindfolded, as if there were war clouds on the horizon and this Nation was about to rush into war. What about the aviation program of one hundred and seventy millions? Such tomfoolery as this is what makes the balance of the world despise us. Such unwarranted allegations are what hurts our foreign trade. Admiral Jones has just testified before the Naval Affairs Committee that another disarmament conference will be held in three years, at which all five of the world powers will be represented. If this Nation starts the construction of a program costing more than a billion dollars, we will be in the same attitude as we were in 1922, when it was necessary to scrap nearly \$300,000,000 worth of new ships in order to bring about a disarmament agreement.

Yesterday the representatives of the shipbuilding corporations testified that not a single ship could be completed within three years; therefore, if contracts are let for this enormous program, the other nations of the world will be sufficiently wise to realize that the best method of combatting this situation will be to reduce their tonnage to such a figure as to cause us to scrap some more new ships. Every competent witness that has testified before the committee makes the positive statement that no

nation on earth can land an army on our shores as long as we have adequate aircraft. It was likewise testified that we could fly our seaplanes out 200 miles from shore and destroy an approaching enemy. Testimony was also given that it would be impossible, even with cruisers, to protect our commerce in time of war, provided the same passed within striking distance of any major nation with which we might be at war.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Can the gentleman give us any information as to how many cruisers and other vessels for war purposes we have under construction at the present time?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I will try to answer that before I get through. I do not want to break the continuity of my speech.

During the World War the submarine was the ship that struck terror to the hearts of the people and was the most feared. To combat this menace the destroyer was found to be the most efficient ship; therefore, if it is necessary to protect this country in the way of a surface shipbuilding program, then the most efficient step that could be taken would be to decommission a lot of old obsolete ships, using the men and officers to man the one hundred and fifty-odd destroyers that we now have tied up at docks at Philadelphia and San Diego, and, in addition, build enough submarines, using the latest safety devices of rescue, so as to make this a real arm of defense.

Everyone knows that the submarine is the only kind of a ship that could possibly enter into the harbor of a city like New York in time of war; therefore, if this is true, why waste our money in building up a peace-time Navy such as the Secretary of the Navy says is endorsed by himself and the President of the United States. Of course, the Navy realizes that unless it gets this building program authorized and started building before the convening of the next disarmament conference the expenditures will never be made, keeping in mind that there are nearly 600 officers in Washington that would welcome berths on new cruisers rather than quarters in submarines and destroyers.

I venture to assert that England and the other powers of the world would not object if the United States should build 100 cruisers, realizing that we could not use them in war, except in protected zones; yet if the so-called war party of this Nation wants to bring about a situation that will startle the world let them suggest the construction of about 60 new submarines and see how quickly this will bring about an international colloquy for the purpose of either banning this type of vessel or causing the same to be the subject of serious consideration at the disarmament conference in Washington in 1931.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It is refreshing to hear one member of the Naval Affairs Committee speak for the people. The rest of the committee usually speak for the Navy. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does he think these big naval officers will be satisfied with anything but large vessels on which they have their retinues of attendants and where it takes about four different officers in relays to reach them from the deck to their cabin? They are the kind of ships upon which they like to function in peace times. I want to say to the gentleman that I would like him to give us his idea about the proposal which now comes from the Navy that they shall have an assistant on the floor of the House to speak for the Navy

on all questions when a Member of Congress gets up to speak for the people.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I want to say, in answer to the question the gentleman has asked, that there are approximately 600 naval officers in Washington; and all of these officers desire at some time to command a great, big, fine ship that has lovely and luxurious quarters. If I were in the Navy, or if the gentleman were in the Navy, to be perfectly fair and frank about it, he and I would want the same thing. But this is a war program when there is no sign of a war in sight. We ought not to be building for a peace program. We ought to build a program for preparedness. We ought to prepare this Nation so that it will be able to defend itself against any kind of a situation which would ever confront it; and if that is true, taking the lessons of the last war, let us build the kind of a ship which would enable us to stand off every country in the world if that condition should arise. [Applause.] That is the way I view this situation.

As to that part of your question which refers to the Navy having an assistant on the floor of the House to speak for the Navy on all subjects, it is now known that the Navy already prepares practically all of the bills they desire enacted into law which relate to departmental matters. These are either given to the chairman or some member of the committee, who introduces same on the floor of the House; then they go back to the clerk of the committee, who refers them to the same source from which they originated, and a report is made. In many times the report is prepared ahead of the time the bill is introduced. Therefore, according to the present procedure, practically no legislation can be enacted into law without the indorsement of the Navy for the reason the officers in charge of this great bureau have practically a strangle hold on the functions of the committee having jurisdiction over this subject. If anyone in the Navy wants to represent the same on the floor of the House, let him resign his position, go back home, and offer himself as a candidate for Congress; then, if he is elected, he may speak out in any way he sees fit. At the present time this Government suffers from too much bureaucratic control, and it is growing worse. If improvements are not to be had in the very near future, the time will eventually arrive when the people will have to rise up in some forcible manner and demand their rights.

Many students of the Geneva conference are of the opinion that an agreement could have been reached if the United States had agreed to put 6-inch guns on the new type of cruiser desired. However, when it is known that the Navy kept Admiral Jones in England off and on for a period of two years in conference with certain naval officers and that all naval officers are against the reduction of ships, it can be easily understood why the disarmament conference at Geneva was the most successfully concluded of any ever held, from the standpoint of the officers in the Navy.

I am only bringing this to your attention for one reason. I think every class of people in this Nation ought to be properly posted. I think the facts ought to be given to the public, and I am only presenting here what I would like to have presented to me if I were not a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. [Applause.]

Under the leave granted to me I insert the following table, which was prepared by the Navy and submitted to members of the Naval Affairs Committee:

	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	Totals
1. New construction already building:										
Submarines V-5 and 6.....	\$1,890,000	\$2,000,000								\$3,890,000
Cruisers 24 and 25.....	7,800,000	450,000								8,250,000
Cruisers 26, 27, and 30.....	21,000,000	13,800,000								34,800,000
Cruisers 28, 29, and 31.....	17,310,000	23,140,000	\$9,350,000							49,800,000
2. 1928 program:										
Airplane carriers.....	5,700,000	11,400,000	17,100,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$13,300,000	\$7,600,000	\$1,900,000		95,000,000
Light cruisers.....	25,500,000	51,000,000	76,500,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	59,500,000	34,000,000	8,500,000		425,000,000
Destroyer leaders.....	10,000,000	20,000,000	12,500,000	2,500,000						45,000,000
Submarines.....	28,000,000	28,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	21,000,000	7,000,000			175,000,000
3. Aviation construction: <sup>1</sup>										
5-year program.....	18,300,000	22,550,000	24,480,000	20,340,000	18,240,000	16,540,000	16,540,000	16,540,000	16,540,000	170,070,000
4. Aviation construction:										
(a) For cruisers now building.....		1,310,000	1,310,000	660,000	660,000	660,000	660,000	660,000	660,000	6,580,000
(b) For 1928 program.....		1,500,000	1,700,000	9,180,000	10,550,000	11,180,000	13,360,000	13,190,000	9,730,000	70,390,000
5. Net increased cost, due to 1928 program and ships now building; includes personnel, and operation of ships and planes.....	3,025,000	9,811,000	14,469,000	16,423,000	25,208,000	33,121,000	41,049,000	47,752,000	51,883,000	242,741,000
Total of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.....	124,525,000	184,961,000	192,409,000	188,103,000	193,638,000	155,301,000	120,209,000	88,542,000	78,813,000	1,326,521,000
Cost of Naval Establishment other than covered by items 1 to 5 above.....	295,870,000	306,623,000	312,695,000	316,805,000	320,933,000	321,516,000	323,259,000	325,505,000	326,699,000	2,849,905,000
Total estimated costs per annum.....	420,395,000	491,584,000	505,104,000	504,908,000	514,571,000	476,817,000	443,468,000	414,047,000	405,512,000	4,176,426,000
Average annual expenditures for items 1, 2, 3, and 4, covering cost of new ships and aircraft and item 5 covering cost of operating such construction.....										147,391,222
Average annual expenditures, excluding items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. That is, cost of operating and maintaining present Navy, including personnel without any new construction, but including cost of modernizing Oklahoma and Nevada.....										316,656,111
Total average annual expenditures for present Navy plus cost of 1924 and 1928 building programs and 5-year aviation program and including all costs of operating and personnel.....										464,047,333

<sup>1</sup> Includes rigid airships and planes for Naval Reserve training.



W. L. CLAYTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the press dispatches in the morning paper carry a statement from W. L. Clayton, of the firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co., in which he denies the statement made by me on the floor of the House a few days ago charging his firm, together with others, with violating the Sherman Antitrust Act in unlawfully manipulating the cotton market. In that dispatch Mr. Clayton says:

I have never made the boast which Representative RANKIN attributes to me—

referring to the charge that he is alleged to have stated that firms other than his own could not hope to avoid loss in the cotton business unless they could correctly guess his mind.

That statement is alleged to have been made in a speech before a general meeting of the New York Cotton Exchange members during May, 1926, and has been repeatedly quoted ever since that time, but this is the first time Mr. Clayton has ever denied it, so far as I have been able to learn.

My authority for that statement is contained in a speech made by Mr. Arthur R. Marsh, a former president of the New York Cotton Exchange, on February 6, 1928, to the exchange members. Mr. Marsh is an authority on cotton. He was recently retained by the Hon. Charles Evans Hughes to prepare a brief on the operation of hedges on cotton exchanges. In his speech to the members of the New York Cotton Exchange on February 6, Mr. Marsh said:

That responsibility was irrevocably fixed when in this very room, at the general meeting of the members of the New York Cotton Exchange held in May, 1927, Mr. Clayton, with amazing assurance unqualifiedly avowed that firms other than his own can not hope to avoid loss in the cotton business unless they can correctly guess his mind.

No one has denied that Mr. Clayton made this speech, although I understand that several hundred members of the exchange were present when Mr. Marsh made this statement.

I wonder if Mr. Clayton denies having made that speech. If he has been misquoted, is it not passing strange that he never noticed the error until it was brought to light on the floor of the House? Mr. Clayton says in his statement of yesterday:

My firm has violated no law. We have done nothing of which we or any of our friends need be ashamed. No act of ours has had the intent or the effect of depressing the cotton market.

Let us see about that. Mr. Clayton has not denied, and he can not deny, that his firm and their confederates had shipped from the New Orleans territory and concentrated in New York between one hundred and forty and two hundred thousand bales—largely transfer cotton—at a loss of from \$4 to \$5 a bale, practically all of which still remains in New York and was shipped there within the last 16 months to be used as a club in manipulating the market and depressing prices.

One of the best witnesses to prove the iniquity of that action is Mr. W. L. Clayton himself, who said in a speech in Atlanta, Ga., on April 9, 1926:

The October-December operation last season is a concrete example. October, 1924, when practically all cotton was tenderable, went to a premium of about 100 points over December and attracted a stock of 175,000 bales to New York; and under the weight of this cotton December sold at 40 to 50 points under December, New Orleans, whereas the normal parity should be 75 to 80 points over December, New Orleans.

That statement shows that Mr. Clayton knew then that the concentration of this alleged stock of cotton in New York would become a most powerful weapon in the hands of any manipulator for controlling or depressing the cotton market.

In that same speech Mr. Clayton, in speaking of the enormous advantages which his firm has enjoyed, used this astounding language:

Meantime we must be excused if we fail to feel any sense of commercial perversion in continuing to play the game according to the rules.

Admitting in that speech that he must be excused for failing to feel any sense of commercial perversion, we are not surprised that after carrying out the very same nefarious practices, Mr. Clayton comes out in the press of yesterday and says that he did nothing of which he need feel ashamed.

Mr. Clayton and those confederated with him in this gigantic conspiracy are now pretending to welcome an investigation they are going to get. Not only are they slated for an in-

vestigation by the House and Senate of the United States but the Department of Justice as well. And that is likely to prove the most interesting investigation they have ever faced, for it promises also to furnish them with a grand jury investigation, as well as proceedings to seize and confiscate this great bulk of cotton which they have unlawfully concentrated and used to manipulate the cotton market in violation of the law.

Not only that but there are probably other investigations awaiting them. Every person, firm, or corporation from whom they have taken money through these manipulations has a right under the law to go into court, bring suit, and recover judgment for their losses.

Let Congress go to the bottom of this matter, not only in its investigations but also in backing up the Department of Justice in their attempt to clear this condition up in order that we may assure the American people that this will never occur again. [Applause.]

## PIONEERS IN THE WOMAN MOVEMENT

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the month of January of this year I communicated with the National Woman's Party, whose national headquarters is at 21 First Street NE., Washington, D. C., at the request of some of the club women of my district in Georgia, who were and are interested in obtaining information in respect of the lives of Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who were the pioneers of the equal-rights movement, and whose statues are in the crypt of the Capitol.

Personally speaking, I think this statue of these famous and historic women should be taken from its hiding place in the crypt of the Capitol, where few people ever see it, and that it should be placed on the second floor, where all visitors to the Capitol from this country and other nations of the world may have the opportunity of seeing the same.

The just tribute to which these three outstanding women are entitled, and which will probably be the last which this Government will ever be asked to bestow, will never be completed or grow into full fruition until their statue is placed on the second floor of this Capitol, where it can be seen by visitors as they come and go during the ages to follow. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That requires congressional action, and if the gentleman would introduce a resolution to that effect, we could then get action and get the statue moved up where it ought to be.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I have been thinking of doing that for some time. The bill for this purpose will be ready for introduction within a day or two.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does the gentleman from Georgia propose to give a history of the life of all three of these ladies or just the one?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I was only asked to give that of Miss Anthony.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think it would be well to do that as to all three of them?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I do, and I will be glad to comply with the gentleman's suggestion.

In one of the letters from Miss Mabel Vernon, national executive secretary of the National Woman's Party, she stated that they would like to have February 15, the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, observed as widely as possible. She further stated in this letter that they would appreciate it if I would call attention to the work of this great woman on that day on the floor of the House of Representatives. I take pleasure in complying with this request, and now present to the House of Representatives a brief statement of the life and activities of Miss Anthony, which was sent to me by Miss Vernon, and also statements of the lives and activities of Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the same, respectively, being in words and figures as follows:

## SUSAN B. ANTHONY—MILITANT SUFFRAGIST (1820-1906)

Born in South Adams, Mass., February 15, 1820.

Died in Rochester, N. Y., March 13, 1906.

Father: A cotton manufacturer and liberal Quaker, who educated his daughters to be self-supporting. Moved to Rochester in 1848.

Teaching: Taught in New York from 1835 to 1850. When she was 17 she received \$1.50 a week and "boarded round"—excellent wages for a woman.

## SUFFRAGE AND EQUAL-RIGHTS WORK

1852. Met Mrs. Stanton, the suffrage leader, at Seneca Falls. Joined Mrs. Stanton, Horace Greeley, and others in an attempt to have women admitted to the "People's College," then being started. But it was merged into Cornell and women excluded.

At the temperance convention in Albany, to which she was a delegate, she rose to speak to a motion, but was rebuked by the presiding officer, who told her that "the sisters were not invited to speak but to listen and learn." She and three or four other women left the hall.

1853. The first woman to speak on the floor of a teachers' convention. She helped to introduce a resolution for recognition of the right of women teachers to equal pay, which was carried despite the president's protests.

1854. Held suffrage meetings in every county in New York. Held suffrage conventions in every year after that up to Civil War. Petitions for suffrage and equal guardianship rights for women drawn up at State suffrage convention were presented to New York Legislature.

Canvassed New York annually with similar petitions to the legislature. Traveled to many towns off the railroad line, enduring many hardships.

1859. Forced to abandon speaking because of a breakdown in health, she continued writing and circularizing. She wrote: "No genuine equality, no real freedom, no true manhood or womanhood can exist on any foundation save that of pecuniary independence."

1861. Persuaded to give up preparations for the annual women's rights convention to concentrate on work to win the war, though she was not misled by the sophistry that the rights of women would be recognized after the war if they helped to end it.

1863. Organized Woman's National Loyal League to support the Government in the Civil War.

1864. She agitated for the inclusion of women in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. Even the abolitionists opposed her, saying, "This is the negro's hour." Miss Anthony then decided to devote more effort to State campaigns so that the demand of women for national enfranchisement would have behind it the power of votes.

1872. Arrested.

She determined to test the fifteenth amendment. She was allowed to register in Rochester and to cast her ballot. She was arrested, tried, and found guilty by an instructed jury. A fine was imposed, which she refused to pay, saying, "I shall earnestly and persistently continue to urge all women to the practical recognition of the old revolutionary maxim, 'Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God.'"

1878. Secured the introduction for the first time in the United States Senate of a Federal suffrage amendment in the same form in which the nineteenth amendment was finally passed.

## ATTITUDE ON POLITICS

Miss Anthony's attitude toward political parties is illustrated by her words, "My view of our true position is to hold ourselves as a balance of power, to give aid and comfort to the party which shall inscribe on its banners 'Freedom to women.' I do not expect any man to see and act with me, but I do not understand how any woman can do otherwise than refuse to accept any party which ignores her sex."

Immediately upon the mention of the claims of women in the platform of the Republican Party Miss Anthony made an effort to have the Democrats follow suit. Her political policy was adopted by the National Woman's Party and followed from 1913 on.

1896. Entered the presidential campaigns and spoke for suffrage at every party convention.

Continuously until her death in 1906 worked for suffrage in State-to-State campaigns. She always advocated securing suffrage by Federal action and constantly protested to Congress against the necessity of laborious State-by-State campaigns; but she realized that Congress would not act until women had sufficient voting power in the States to compel it.

Throughout her life Miss Anthony's watchword was "No compromise."

TO SUSAN B. ANTHONY

(Reprinted on cover of Suffragist, February 13, 1915)

Something there was that you imagined not,  
For all your wisdom, temperate and high,  
How unto us, to whom the kinder years  
Secure a fairer fight, an easier lot,  
Your name would be a creed, a battle cry,  
A silver trumpet blowing to the sky.  
Steeling our hearts, filling our eyes with tears,  
Giving us fire and fortitude and love;  
This was, alas! a thing you never guessed—  
How younger women whom you knew not of  
Would rise and call you blessed.

—By Alice Duer Miller, in New York Tribune.

LUCRETIA MOTT

Lucretia Mott was born January 3, 1793, on the island of Nantucket, the second child of Thomas and Anna Coffin. Her ancestors had lived on the island of Nantucket since its first settlement by white men in

1659. Lucretia spent her childhood there and many times in later life refers to the years she spent on this island.

Captain Coffin, Lucretia's father, was engaged in the sea trade with East India and was often gone long from his home. At those times her mother, Anna Coffin, with six little children carried on the activities of the home. Lucretia, writing in her diary of those early days, said: "In those early days I was actively useful to my mother, who in the absence of my father on his long voyages carried on a mercantile business and often made trips to Boston to purchase goods." The exercise of women's talents in this line, as well as the general care which devolved on them in the absence of their husbands, tended to develop and strengthen them mentally and physically.

Captain Coffin with his family moved to Boston in 1804.

At 13 years of age Lucretia, with a younger sister, was sent to the Friends Boarding School at Nine Partners, N. Y. At this school she became a fast friend of Sarah Mott, a sister of James Mott, whom she afterwards married.

After two years as pupil she was appointed assistant teacher at a salary of \$100 a year. At the end of the year she received further promotion as regular teacher, with the inducement that in this position her younger sister would be entitled to her education.

The family moved to Philadelphia in 1809.

In 1811, in her nineteenth year, Lucretia married James Mott. In their young married life there were many turns of fortune, all of which she met in heroic manner.

When their little family was growing about them and Mr. Mott was becoming prosperous in business, Mrs. Mott, now 25 years of age, felt called to a more public life and engaged in the ministry of the Society of Friends and became an inspiring preacher and lecturer.

In all her efforts she had the cordial support of her husband. The names of James and Lucretia Mott were inseparably linked in their public activities. Their home was a meeting place for eminent persons, including visitors from abroad.

In 1840 a world's antislavery convention was called in London. Women from Boston, New York, and Philadelphia were delegates to that convention. Lucretia Mott was one of the delegates, but on her arrival in England her credentials were not accepted because she was a woman.

At this convention she met Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Mrs. Mott and Mrs. Stanton, sitting in the railed-off space assigned to women, had listened to a long debate on the question of admitting women as members of the convention. They had heard the last thing before adjournment the overwhelming chorus of "noes" that barred women out. They left the hall together, "burning with indignation," and resolved on their way back to their lodgings that when they went home they would call a convention to take up just one thing—the rights of women.

The result of this meeting was the first women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, N. Y., July 19 and 20, 1848.

The Declaration of Independence was chosen as a model for a "declaration of sentiments" to be presented at the convention, and a list of 18 grievances was collected to match the 18 set forth by the declaration of 1776.

This enumeration complains of the deprivation of the franchise; the exclusion from legislative bodies; civil death upon marriage; moral irresponsibility for crimes committed in the presence of the husband; loss of property rights upon marriage; inequality in the laws of divorce and guardianship of children; taxation without representation; exclusion from nearly all profitable employments, and discrimination in pay in those employments which she is permitted to follow; exclusion from teaching theology, medicine, or law; exclusion from all colleges; exclusion from the ministry and an equal participation in the affairs of the church; and the creation of a false public sentiment through the promulgation of two codes of morals. It concludes "He has endeavored in every way that he could to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life."

As the "declaration of sentiments" covered the entire feminist program, the resolutions have a familiar ring. Thus we find an important aim of the Woman's Party in the fourth resolution "that the women of this country ought to be enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live that they may no longer publish their degradation by declaring themselves satisfied with their present position, nor their ignorance by asserting that they have all the rights they want."

No man was called in the first day of the convention, when the real work was done in a meeting of which no record seems to have been preserved. It was hastily decided on the second day not only to permit the men to remain but to make James Mott chairman of the meeting. Mrs. Mott was an experienced and self-possessed speaker, but was handicapped for the position of chairman by a light voice.

The Seneca Falls convention adjourned after two days, but so many points of discussion had developed that it was agreed to have another meeting at Rochester two weeks later. This meeting was filled to overflowing.



In 1852 Mrs. Mott was elected president of the women's rights convention at Syracuse. The Syracuse Standard reports that she presided with an ease, dignity, and grace that might be envied by the most experienced legislator in the country.

Mrs. Mott was the first president of the Equal Rights Association, founded in New York in 1866.

She presided in January, 1869, at the first woman suffrage convention ever held in Washington. All associations friendly to woman's rights were invited to send delegates to this convention.

The last convention at which Lucretia Mott appeared was the convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association in 1879, when she was 86 years old.

Lucretia Mott spent her last days at Roadside, near Philadelphia. She died November 11, 1880, and is buried in the Friends Burying Ground at Fair Hill. At the time of her death memorial services were held in many cities throughout the country, at which tribute was paid to her life and work.

Carrying on the fight for equality in which Lucretia Mott led the way, the Woman's Party is now working for an amendment to the United States Constitution which provides: "Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction." This amendment is called the "Lucretia Mott amendment."

[NOTE.—The above information taken from History of Woman Suffrage, edited by Ida Husted Harper; an article by Lucretia Mott Motchell in January-February, 1921, issue of the Suffragist; article by Carol Rehlfisch in June 23, 1923, issue of Equal Rights; Life and Letters of James and Lucretia Mott by Anna Davis Hallowell.]

#### ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, ONE OF THE THREE PIONEERS IN THE WOMAN MOVEMENT

Elizabeth Cady was born at Johnstown, N. Y., November 12, 1815, the daughter of Daniel Cady, judge of the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals of New York, and of Margaret Livingston Cady, the daughter of Col. James Livingston, of General Washington's staff. She married Henry Brewster Stanton in 1840, and in May of that year attended the World's Antislavery Convention in London. Mrs. Stanton and other women were not allowed to take seats because of their sex. She and Lucretia Mott decided to call a woman's rights convention upon their return to America. Together they wrote the call to the Seneca Falls convention of 1848. At the first session Mrs. Stanton offered a resolution demanding the ballot for women as the most important right, which was adopted in the face of protest.

In 1863 Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony formed the Woman's Loyal League, of which Mrs. Stanton was president. In 1867 the two women established The Revolution, a political newspaper, of which Mrs. Stanton was editor in chief.

In 1869 was founded the National Woman's Suffrage Association, of which Mrs. Stanton was president more than 25 years. At the convention of the association in Washington in 1878 Mrs. Stanton brought forward the demand for a separate woman suffrage amendment.

Mrs. Stanton conceived the idea of the International Council of Women and presided at the first meeting in Washington, March, 1888.

She worked for and helped to secure in some States property rights for women, equal guardianship laws, and their right to their own wages.

She died October 26, 1902, the last document she signed being a plea for liberty for women, which appeared in an editorial in a New York newspaper.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow morning, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes concerning the passage of the bill S. 700, as amended in the House, along the line of the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

#### TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10635) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10635, with Mr. Michener in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read down to and including line 4 on page 56.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday when the paragraph on the Coast Guard was considered I was called out of the Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the committee for seven minutes on that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden] and his subcommittee for their treatment of the Coast Guard in this bill, and especially in their recognition of the fact that new buildings and repairs are so vitally necessary. There are more Coast Guard stations in my district than any other in America, and it is my pleasure to know all the men in the service down there, and to appreciate the magnificent work they have done. The Coast Guard is one of the least understood and one of the least known of our departments of Government, and they have no papers or press agents to carry what they are doing to the country.

Did you know—

That in the last fiscal year they saved or rescued from peril 3,313 human souls, the largest number in any one year since the organization of the service, and that the total number of assistance rendered was 5,508?

Did you know—

That the value of the ships and cargoes assisted was \$37,801,357, and that in the enforcement of the laws of the United States—navigation, motor boat, and custom laws—68,223 vessels were boarded and examined during the year?

Did you know—

That in the Mississippi floods last spring the Coast Guard removed 43,853 persons from perilous positions and saved 11,313 herds of livestock?

Those are just a few examples of a phase of their work that is not generally known. In recent years the Coast Guard has been called upon to enforce a law, the righteousness or possible unwisdom of which is not to be discussed, but the fact is that, having to administer this law, the great and noble purpose for which they were created is being fast overshadowed, and in some sections they have become the target for slurs and falsehoods and insinuations.

When the marine is carried away from his country and loved ones to chase Sandino, he does not stop to question what his Government's foreign policy is. When the man in the Navy is carried to eastern waters and landed in China, he does not stop to reason why. When the man in the Army is called out to preserve the peace, he does not ask why he is there. And so it is not in the province of the Coast Guard, nor do they question the wisdom of a law they are called on to enforce, but perform their duty with a singleness of purpose and unafraid. And yet the marine and the soldier and the sailor are not criticized for obeying orders, while the Coast Guard in the performance of their duty are having hurled at their heads in some sections the terms "spy," "detective," and "snooper."

They are exposed to more temptations than any men in any service anywhere. Snags and pitfalls are thrown across their path, but to their everlasting credit they are meeting the test and coming out unscathed. Just a few months ago in this campaign of detraction that has been carried on against the Coast Guard in some sections, there was published in one of the leading magazines in the country an article carrying the inference that the service was shot through with graft. I tell you, both from knowledge, information, and investigation that it is a miserable lie and a slander and insult offered to brave men.

I want to see this great organization expand and grow. I want to see the ambitions and aspirations that its great admiral—and he is an administrative genius—has for the service realized. I want to see the housing facilities at many of the stations so improved that at least the men may have the ordinary comforts of life. I want to see the man when he enters the service have the incentive that after he has served his Government loyally and faithfully for 30 long years in this perilous work, that he may be retired upon his option. I want to see every man in charge of an active station a warrant officer. I want to see Congress abandon its policy of indifference and neglect, and hereafter give this organization the necessary appropriations to decently and efficiently operate.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman must know, I assume, that the Coast Guard has the same retirement privileges that the Army and the Navy have.

Mr. WARREN. I fully understand that.

Mr. MADDEN. I was wondering what the gentleman meant by stating he wanted to see them have retirement privileges.

Mr. WARREN. I did not say retirement. Here is what I was going to say: Some day, when we have more men here

in Congress who think in terms of human rather than property rights, we are going to make a fight to place the Coast Guard under the pension laws of the country, where they ought to be.

Mr. MADDEN. They have better provisions now. They have the retirement privileges that the Army and the Navy have.

Mr. WARREN. I fully understand that, but they are not under the pension laws like the Army and the Navy.

Mr. MADDEN. They are; exactly.

Mr. WARREN. Well, I still beg leave to disagree with the gentleman, and I will point that out later.

The man in the Coast Guard is just as much in the service of his country as the man in the Army and Navy, for in time of war they are part of the armed forces; but yet, when one of them dies or is killed in the performance of his duty or is foully murdered, as is frequently the case, their loved ones receive a notation that he was a brave man, and they are granted six months' pay. Pitiful cases of distress and need are coming in from all sections.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman will permit, they have the same rights with respect to war-risk insurance as the men in the Army and the Navy at the present time.

Mr. WARREN. I understand that.

Now, answering the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], of course I know that the same retirement law applies to the Army, the Navy, and the Coast Guard. When a man in the Army or Navy is killed in the performance of his duty his dependents come under the pension laws. This is not true of the Coast Guard, and this discrimination is what I am protesting against. Just recently a fine young man in the service from my district was brutally murdered in the performance of his duty in Florida. He left a wife and several small children, who are destitute. The only aid they got was six months' salary under the retirement act. I know that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has been a consistent friend of the Coast Guard, and I hope that we will have the benefit of his great influence to remedy this discrimination.

Our Government is too great and too fair to mete out this injustice and to tolerate this situation to exist much longer.

I love to think of the Coast Guard, gentlemen of the House, as fulfilling the mission for which it was created. I like to think of it as serving humanity. I like to picture the sun-crowned but lonely patrol on our wind-swept coast burning his Coston signal to herald that succor is near.

I like to picture the man in the lookout with his eagle eye sweeping the sea in his eternal vigil. I like to picture them in their surfboats through mountainous seas and storms and tempests snatching men from the very jaws of death. I like to picture them as firing the gun and sending true the line, and with strong hands and fearless hearts bringing in to safety human beings who had despaired of all. I like to see them in their stations rendering aid and sympathy and love to the unfortunate sojourners whom fate throws up in their midst. That is what the Coast Guard is. That is my conception of the service. That is where their heart is, and that is why their deeds have been one grand epic that sweeps down the decades.

They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters—these see the works of the Lord and his wonders in the deep.

The Clerk read as follows:

Operating supplies: For fuel, steam, gas for lighting and heating purposes, water, ice, lighting supplies, electric current for lighting, heating, and power purposes, telephone service for custodial forces; removal of ashes and rubbish, snow, and ice; cutting grass and weeds, washing towels, and miscellaneous items for the use of the custodial forces in the care and maintenance of completed and occupied public buildings and the grounds thereof under the control of the Treasury Department, and in the care and maintenance of the equipment and furnishings in such buildings; miscellaneous supplies, tools, and appliances required in the operation (not embracing repairs) of the mechanical equipment, including heating, plumbing, hoisting, gas piping, ventilating, vacuum-cleaning and refrigerating apparatus, electric-light plants, meters, interior pneumatic-tube and intercommunicating telephone systems, conduit wiring, call-bell and signal systems in such buildings, and for the transportation of articles or supplies, authorized herein (including the customhouse in the District of Columbia, but excluding any other public building under the control of the Treasury Department within the District of Columbia, and excluding also marine hospitals and quarantine stations, mints, branch mints, and assay offices, and personal services, except for work done by contract or for temporary job labor under exigency not exceeding at one time the sum of \$100 at any one building), \$3,090,000. The appropriation made herein for gas shall include the rental and use of gas governors when ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury in writing: *Provided*, That rentals shall not be paid for such gas governors greater than 35 per

cent of the actual value of the gas saved thereby, which saving shall be determined by such tests as the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to contract for the purchase of fuel for public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department in advance of the availability of the appropriation for the payment thereof. Such contracts, however, shall not exceed the necessities of the current fiscal year.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, line 17, after the word "that," insert the word "hereafter."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, we have been carrying this language for a great many years. It requires the Secretary of the Treasury to get a supply of coal in advance—to contract for it a year in advance. It has been carried for a long time, and there has been no objection to it. It ought to be carried, and I see no reason why we should not make it permanent; and that is the reason we are offering the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

To enable the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind in accordance with the provisions of the act approved August 4, 1919, \$65,000.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 13, after the figures "\$65,000," insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated shall not be expended unless two copies of each publication printed by the American Printing House for the Blind during the fiscal year 1929 shall be furnished free of charge to the National Library for the Blind, located in Washington, D. C."

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear from the gentleman from Tennessee as to the authority of law.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the amendment does not carry any legislation. It is purely a limitation. It does not instruct or direct the American Printing House Co.; there is no provision directing the American Printing House for the Blind to furnish the publications. It simply says if it does not furnish them it shall not get the money. There is no legislation in the amendment. There is no duty imposed on this printing institution in Louisville, Ky.; it is not required to furnish them; it is simply a limitation on the appropriation that it is not to be available unless they do the thing provided in the amendment. I insist that there is no legislation in it, and it is not subject to a point of order.

I am perfectly aware that any limitation which carries with it legislation or which imposes additional duties on officials of the Government is subject to a point of order. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, the American Printing House for the Blind is not a Government institution. Therefore if it carried direction to that printing house to supply these books it would not be subject to the objection that it was imposing additional duties on Government officials. In addition to that, I repeat that there is nothing in the amendment requiring the American Printing House for the Blind to furnish books. It simply says if you do not do it you do not get the money.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I am not able to agree with the gentleman from Tennessee. The language of the amendment is ingeniously drawn and its purpose is legislation. The acts of Congress of 1919 and 1927 which authorize the appropriation of money for the American Printing House for the Blind relate back to and tie into the basic act of 1879, the act of Congress which provided that the money appropriated thereunder for the purpose of the American Printing House for the Blind shall be expended for books and periodicals for the education of the blind of the entire country and shall be apportioned to the schools for the blind in all the States of the Union and to the Territories, including the District of Columbia, according to the number of blind pupils in these schools as regularly and annually certified by the superintendents of the respective schools for this purpose.

Now, these acts which determine how this money shall be expended limit the application of funds made under appropriations for these schools for the blind; that is to say, to those that have been established agreeably to the laws of the States and Territories.



To-day these books and apparatus which, under the basic law, must be furnished to the schools for the education of the blind in the country without a cent of profit on their production to the American Printing House for the Blind, are distributed in this way, and the purpose of the amendment is to set aside the existing law to the extent of making it mandatory as to \$1,280 worth of books that they shall furnish the National Library for the Blind, which is a private institution, though receiving a gratuity of \$5,000 a year under congressional appropriation, and which is not entitled under existing law to receive any of these books at all. Hence, the amendment, if adopted, will change the basic law of Congress.

I submit, therefore, that the proposed amendment is legislation pure and simple, and it illustrates the wisdom of the rule that legislation should not come in this form on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the Chair unduly. Much that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THATCHER] has said refers to the merits of the amendment. That is a matter for discussion if the amendment should be held in order. My point is simply this: Congress heretofore passed acts authorizing certain appropriations. Of course the Chair is familiar with the fact that merely because an act has been passed authorizing an appropriation it is not necessary for Congress to make the appropriation, either in the amount named in the authorization act or any part of it, if Congress does not see fit to do so. The authorization act simply provides that Congress may do it if it sees fit on an appropriation bill, and brings it within the rules of the House.

Here is an appropriation of \$65,000 in addition to the \$10,000 which is carried under a permanent appropriation. This amendment simply provides that this \$65,000 herein appropriated shall not be expended unless the American Printing House for the Blind shall furnish to the National Library for the Blind, located here in the city of Washington, to the upkeep of which our Government contributes, two copies of each publication during the fiscal year 1929. There is no legislation in that. If the American Printing House for the Blind does not want to furnish the copies, it need not do it, but it will not get the appropriation unless it does. There is no direction or duty sought to be imposed. The amendment simply provides that if they want the \$65,000 they have to supply this National Library for the Blind in the District of Columbia with two copies free of these publications. I insist that it is not legislation and no duty or obligation is imposed upon the American Printing House for the Blind.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the law of 1879 clearly obligates this institution, the American Printing House for the Blind, to contribute books and prints to public institutions of learning for the blind in the States. I apprehend there has been no question about the fulfillment of that obligation. The amendment offered by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] obligates the American Printing House for the Blind to supply two books of each kind printed to the National Library for the Blind, located in the city of Washington. It is a library, not a public institution of learning, such as is referred to in the States. The question arises, Shall we differentiate between what the act originally said, under which the American Printing House for the Blind is compelled to supply books to these educational institutions in the States, and a library for the blind, privately owned, privately operated, to which the Government, it is true contributes something annually, though I apprehend that that has nothing to do with the point of order? The only question that arises in my mind is whether the National Library for the Blind comes within the rule laid down in the law of 1879 requiring the Printing House for the Blind to contribute these books. If it comes within that law, of course I apprehend that the amendment is not necessary. If it does not come within the law, then the amendment would be clearly without the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The law seems to refer to public institutions. If this library for the blind is a public institution, then there would be some justification for holding the amendment in order. The precedents of the House hold that a limitation accompanied by an affirmative direction to a departmental officer by the use of the word "unless," he shall do some particular thing, is, in effect, legislation and therefore not in order.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNS. I again call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this is not a public institution and this is therefore not an instruction, as I said, to any departmental officer or any officer of the Government. It is purely a private institution.

Mr. THATCHER. But this is under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury, and reports must be made to

the Secretary of the Treasury, and this appropriation is made under the auspices of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The law provides that these copies may be furnished upon the "request" of the institution. The amendment provides a direction to deliver, notwithstanding that no request has been made, but not until certain prescribed action has been taken. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS: Page 64, line 13, after the figures "\$65,000," insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be expended until the said American Printing House for the Blind shall have filed with the Treasurer of the United States an agreement in writing that it will furnish free of charge to the National Library for the Blind, located in Washington, D. C., two copies of each publication printed by said American Printing House for the Blind during the fiscal year 1929."

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against that amendment for the same reason, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, the Chair in his ruling stated that the former amendment was a direction to the American Printing House for the Blind to furnish copies of these publications. I respectfully insist that in that amendment and in the amendment now pending there is absolutely and positively no direction to the American Printing House for the Blind to furnish any publications. There is no effort and no purpose in the amendment to compel the American Printing House for the Blind to furnish any publication to the National Library for the Blind, located here in Washington. It simply provides that if they want this \$65,000 they must furnish them. If they do not want to do that, then this \$65,000 remains in the Treasury and is not paid over to them. It is simply a question whether the American Printing House for the Blind wishes to furnish the publications, or whether it prefers not to furnish them and not take the appropriation.

Now something has been said here, Mr. Chairman, about the merits of this proposition. I have in my hand here a statement that shows that of the \$25,000 appropriated under the last act passed, \$12,680 went to increase of salaries. Among those increases—and remember it is a private institution—the superintendent had his salary increased from \$5,000 to \$6,500, and then provided a new assistant superintendent at \$2,500. Then they gave to the printing people and the pressmen little increases of about \$60 a year. So that when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THATCHER] says that this is for the purpose of distributing books free to the States, he is not wholly correct. It seems to me that this semipublic institution here in Washington, which has 13,000 volumes and which furnishes these 13,000 volumes on request to any institution throughout the Union, and for which the Federal Government, through the District of Columbia appropriation bill, appropriates \$5,000 a year, is worthy of consideration. Former Senator Gore, of Oklahoma, who is the chairman of the National Library for the Blind, insists that it is important for this very worthy institution. It has an endowment, but it could not get along without the appropriation from the Government.

Now, what are we asking of this Louisville institution, which has been drawing \$10,000 since 1879, and \$40,000 since 1918, and \$75,000 for the past year? To contribute something which on its own admission will not cost more than \$1,200 a year. I am rather surprised that there should be any objection on the part of that institution to make this little contribution to the institution for the blind here in Washington, which can hardly get along with the \$5,000 which the Government appropriates through the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Now, I insist, Mr. Chairman, that in this amendment there is not the slightest legislation. It is simply a limitation pure and simple, requiring, as many other appropriation items do, that "if you get this money, you must file a written agreement that you will furnish these few books to the National Library." It is entirely optional. It does not impose any legislative duty whatever upon the American Printing House for the Blind or any other institution. It is such a limitation as appears in many other appropriation bills.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the facts with respect to these questions about the salaries granted have been thrashed out before the committee and accepted, and they have been reported to the Treasury Department, and the amounts accepted as being reasonable and justified, and estimates have been submitted and appropriations accordingly made. I am sorry that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has brought this subject in at this stage of the matter, because I think it has no bearing on the question at issue.

Now, the last amendment seeks to do by indirection what can not be done directly. I call the attention of the chairman to the act of March 3, 1879, which provides that certain books and apparatus shall each year be distributed among all the public institutions and establishments for the education of the blind. I read:

1. The income upon the bonds thus held in trust for the education of the blind shall be expended by the trustees of the American Printing House each year in manufacturing and furnishing embossed books for the blind and tangible apparatus for their instruction. And the total amount of such books and apparatus so manufactured and furnished by this income shall each year be distributed among all the public institutions for the education of the blind in the States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, upon the requisition of the superintendent of each, duly certified by its board of trustees. The basis of such distribution shall be the total number of pupils in all the public institutions for the education of the blind, to be authenticated in such manner and as often as the trustees of the said American Printing House shall require; and each institution shall receive, in books and apparatus, that portion of the total income of said bonds, held by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States in trust for the education of the blind, as is shown by the ratio between the number of pupils in that institution for the education of the blind and the total number of pupils in all the public institutions for the education of the blind, which ratio shall be computed upon the first Monday in January of each year.

2. No part of the income from said bonds shall be expended in the erection or leasing of buildings.

3. No profit shall be put on any books or tangible apparatus for the instruction of the blind manufactured or furnished by the trustees of said American Printing House for the Blind, located in Louisville, Ky., and the price put upon each article so manufactured or furnished shall only be its actual cost.

4. The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall have the authority to withhold the income arising from said bonds thus set apart for the education of the blind of the United States whenever he shall receive satisfactory proof that the trustees of said American Printing House for the Blind, located in Louisville, Ky., are not using the income from these bonds for the benefit of the blind in the public institutions for the education of the blind of the United States.

5. Before any money be paid to the treasurer of the American Printing House for the Blind by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the treasurer of the American Printing House for the Blind shall execute a bond, with two approved sureties, to the amount of \$20,000, conditioned that the interest so received shall be expended according to this law and all amendments thereto, which shall be held by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and shall be renewed every two years.

6. The superintendent of the various public institutions for the education of the blind in the United States shall each ex officio be a member of the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind, located in the city of Louisville, Ky.

IV. That the trustees of said American Printing House for the Blind shall annually make to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States a report of the items of their expenditure of the income of said bonds during the year preceding their report, and shall annually furnish him with a voucher from each public institution for the education of the blind, showing that the amount of books and tangible apparatus due has been received.

V. That this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

I may say in passing that the State of Kentucky, which was the pioneer in printing for the blind in this country, began in 1858 to carry on this work. It was quite successful in a local way, with the result that institutions all over the country for the education of the blind joined in requests and made contribution for the purchase of books at cost furnished by the American Printing House for the Blind, and finally Congress passed the act of 1879, prescribing the terms on which books might be printed there for distribution all over the country to the institutions where the blind children were being educated. The State of Kentucky has contributed as a gratuity about \$125,000 to \$150,000 worth of property at Louisville, without one cent of advantage over any other State in the Union; and if this amendment should be adopted, it means that the blind schools of Texas and Minnesota and New York and every other State in the Union will have their allocations of books for use reduced to the extent that books may be furnished this Washington library.

Mr. BYRNS. May I ask, how much will this cost the American Printing House for the Blind?

Mr. THATCHER. It will cost nearly \$1,300 a year.

Mr. BYRNS. How much was the superintendent's salary increased just a year ago?

Mr. THATCHER. It was over a year ago.

Mr. BYRNS. I want to ask the gentleman another question, so he can answer all of these questions. Was not his salary increased \$1,500, from \$5,000 to \$6,500, and did they not provide for a new assistant superintendent at \$2,500 just about a year ago? I submit, if the gentleman's argument be correct, that in the increase which was made then they were cutting the institutions out of their just deserts?

Mr. THATCHER. I will answer the gentleman on that. The present superintendent of this institution was formerly the superintendent for the blind in the State of Texas. He was the unanimous choice of the superintendents of the United States when they assembled, and he was told that if he would give up his work in Texas and take charge of this important work, which needed a superintendent, he would be paid in a short time \$6,500, which he considered as being necessary in order to justify him in giving up his work in Texas.

Mr. BYRNS. How long has he been serving as superintendent?

Mr. THATCHER. Not over two or three years.

Mr. BYRNS. Then they waited for some time before they increased his salary because his salary only went into effect in May, 1927.

Mr. THATCHER. I understand, but the superintendents of the United States agreed to that, and he is only in the position to-day because of the agreement that he should receive that salary if he would give up his work in Texas. As to the other increases, the American Printing House for the Blind has a work that is very technical and very difficult, and these increases were made after the compensation of those employed in every other element of industry in the country had been increased on account of war conditions and after-war conditions. These questions have been gone into by the subcommittees dealing with this appropriation, and they have been shown that these increases were justified.

This proposed amendment undertakes to change the law and to make it obligatory, in order that this appropriation may function at all, that two copies of each of these publications shall be furnished to this particular library, a private institution, at a cost of something like \$1,300 a year. I submit, if that can be done, then the 50 or 60 other libraries for the blind in this country will have the same right and the same justification for asking that they be treated in the same way.

Mr. REED of New York. That is exactly what other institutions will do. The minute you provide that this library shall receive these copies, then every other library in the country will be demanding the same thing.

Mr. BYRNS. How could they demand it with any degree of justice?

Mr. REED of New York. They could do it, and would do it if this action were taken.

Mr. BYRNS. There are no other institutions in any State and there are no other libraries for which the States or Congress appropriates \$75,000 as a gratuity, as is the case in connection with the American Printing House for the Blind, and it seems to me it is a very little thing for the Federal Government, which appropriates as a gratuity \$75,000 to this private institution, to ask that it give \$1,300 worth of publications to this institution in Washington.

Mr. THATCHER. If this action were taken with regard to this institution here there would be the same reason for such action with reference to the other 60 libraries in this country, and they would be making requests of the same character. Every dollar of the \$75,000 appropriated by Congress is expended in the cost of books and apparatus for the blind pupils of the United States, including the Territories and the District of Columbia. The American Printing House for the Blind exists only for this purpose, and it is altogether dependent on this appropriation, and books and apparatus furnished to the schools for the blind throughout the country under the basic act of Congress must be, and are, furnished at cost on a pro rata basis of blind-school population in the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The discussion on the floor has been largely with reference to the merits of the proposition. The Chair is not passing on the merits.

It seems to the Chair that this amendment is clearly a limitation with an affirmative direction. A limitation simply provides that money shall not be spent for a specific purpose. This amendment goes further and says that this money shall not be spent unless or until certain things are done.

One particular decision has been called to the attention of the Chair, rendered in Committee of the Whole, on February 20, 1926, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Begg] was in the chair. At that time the following amendment was offered:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: On page 6, line 1, after the figures "\$3,000,000," insert a colon and the following: "Provided further,



That not more than one-half of this sum shall be expended unless or until plans and estimates are proposed and approved by said commission for the erection near Sechart, France."

And so on. In passing upon a point of order made against the amendment the Chairman said:

From a careful reading of section 2, which has been read by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], it seems to the Chair that the gentleman's amendment, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDELOM] says, directs the commission to do a specific thing, actually changing the basic law creating the commission, and that the amendment does not restrict in any sense the appropriation.

Now, the Chair after examining these two amendments finds that in intent they are very similar.

It can not be said that this amendment restricts the appropriation alone, but goes further and directs that certain things shall be done. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to postmasters, \$52,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to me to take this opportunity to recommend H. R. 5837, introduced by Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. The purpose this bill seeks to accomplish should have been done by Congress many years ago.

The inadequate compensation of the group of faithful public servants the measure is designed to increase has long been a reproach upon the Government. No better evidence need be produced to prove the tardiness of legislation when it comes to rectifying wrongs than the record of neglect in respect to the matters this bill is intended to rectify. Every few years Congress has been enacting legislation to increase the compensation of different groups of postal employees, so that they will more nearly accord with the salaries paid in the industries, so that they will correspond with the increasing costs of living, so that they will provide for the faithful supervisors, carriers, clerks, and laborers wages upon which they can support their families, yet it is astonishing to note that the postmasters of a group of the largest offices in the country, upon whom the heavy responsibilities of management rest, have been ignored.

In saying this I want to make it clear that I do not consider we have yet done all that should be done to aid these faithful employees I have enumerated, for there is pressing need of providing additional grades for them to which they may be promoted as rewards for long service, exceptional efficiency, and so forth, and likewise need for legislation to ameliorate their working conditions. When the opportunity offers for me to support measures of this character it is my purpose to do so, but the measure to which I am now referring is to care for the small group of postmasters who have been, as I have previously said, so long ignored, and it is to this matter I wish particularly to address myself at this time.

As examples of cases of injustice such as I have in mind, of inadequately compensated postmasters, let me instance the two postmasters in my home city—Brooklyn and New York.

The salary of the postmaster at New York was fixed by Congress at but \$8,000, 53 years ago, or, to be exact, May 3, 1875, and it has never been increased since.

At the time Congress acted in this matter we had not yet celebrated the centennial anniversary of this country's birth, and the progress which has since been achieved by the world in science, the arts, and industry is probably greater than the achievements of the world in these directions in all the time which went before. While everything else in the world has moved forward and upward, these salaries have stood absolutely still.

It would be altogether superfluous for me to remind the House of the increased cost of living during these 53 years. Not only has the cost of living kept soaring higher but the standard of living has kept pace with the rising costs, so that the incumbent of this office is not only obliged to spend more for the necessities which sufficed his predecessor in 1875 but he has to live according to the higher standards of to-day, and conform with habits, usages, and practices which were in those so far distant days quite unknown.

In the year 1875, when the salary for the New York postmaster was fixed, the total receipts of the entire postal system of the United States were a little less than one-third of the receipts of the New York post office in 1927. Of course, with the enormous increase in receipts there has come a corresponding increase in the responsibilities of the postmaster. His bond under the law covers every cent of this vast sum, and of many

millions more involved in the money order and postal savings transactions which occur in the New York office.

In my investigation of this subject I found the following very illuminating facts which I am sure will prove of interest to my colleagues of the House. These facts deal with the remarkable growth of the postal business in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, and are staggering in their exposition not only of the great responsibilities of the postmasters of the respective cities, but of the tremendous work that is being done by the Postal Service personnel, whom every fair-minded person will admit are notoriously underpaid. Now, then, let us see:

#### MEMORANDUM

The salary of the postmaster at New York, N. Y., was fixed by a special act of Congress more than 50 years ago.

#### Comparison

Postal receipts	1875	1927
Receipts.....	\$3,166,946.19	\$75,552,970.91
Expenditures.....	839,445.82	36,249,908.13
Surplus.....	2,327,500.37	39,303,062.78

Personnel assigned:	
Number of employees (approximate)—	
1880.....	1,500
1928.....	Over 18,000
Stations operated:	
1880.....	19
1928.....	55

Receipts for the calendar year 1927 approximated the total appropriations made for conducting the entire postal service of the United States at the time the last adjustment of the salary of the postmaster was made.

The volume of business of the New York post office exceeds that of the entire Dominion of Canada.

The volume of business transacted in one month of the present time approximates more than twice the business transacted for the entire year when the salary was first fixed at \$8,000 per annum.

The responsibilities of the postmaster increased correspondingly to the increase of the volume of business and the personnel, and was also increased by the introduction of the following additional new activities of the Postal Service:

Postal savings, established January 1, 1912.

Parcel Post Service, inaugurated January 1, 1913.

Government-owned motor-vehicle service added to the postmaster's responsibilities in December, 1917.

Central accounting system in 1920.

Distribution of supplies.

All of these added activities and the growth of the business increased the responsibilities, but no adjustment in salary has been made.

The New York post office has 55 classified stations and 265 contract stations.

Over 18,000 employees are required to man the service.

It receives, delivers, and dispatches 16,000,000 pieces of ordinary mail daily. Receives, delivers, and dispatches 156,000 pieces of registered mail daily. Receives and dispatches 75,000 insured and C. O. D. parcel-post packages daily. Weighs and dispatches 568,000 pounds of newspapers and periodicals daily. Issues over 600,000 salary checks in a year.

The annual cash receipts and disbursements total approximately \$923,000,000.

Issued in 1927, 5,871,362 domestic money orders, totaling \$66,856,849.

Issued in 1927, 451,503 international money orders, totaling \$8,698,978.

Paid in 1927, 19,343,021 domestic money orders amounting to \$162,940,721.

Paid in 1927, 76,460 international money orders, amounting to \$976,915.

Has on deposit in postal savings \$27,428,142.

Postal Savings depositors total 96,528 accounts.

Maintains a motor-vehicle fleet of 626 trucks and provides repairs and maintenance service for 41 other post offices.

Postal receipts for year ended Dec. 31, 1927.....	\$75,552,970.91
Postal receipts for year ended Dec. 31, 1926.....	72,686,847.40

Increase 3.93 per cent, or..... 2,866,323.31

The increase for one year represents more than twice the volume of business transacted in 1875, when the present salary of the postmaster was fixed.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think the salary of these postmasters should be increased?

Mr. O'CONNELL. I am pleading very earnestly for that. I think we ought to adopt the Sproul bill, which would give

the postmaster at New York \$12,000 a year and pay the postmaster in Brooklyn, who does similarly good work, \$10,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Why not make them both the same?

Mr. O'CONNELL. You bet, I will say to my friend from Illinois, I would very much like to give them both the same salary. They are worth it and more besides, as well as Hon. Skidmore Pettit, the efficient and hard-working postmaster at Jamaica, who serves a large part of my district.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; gladly.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not true that while the work has increased enormously, yet the postmaster at New York City and the postmasters in similar cities have been given a great battery of assistant postmasters and clerks, bureau chiefs, and division chiefs, which has very largely reduced the responsibility and the work of the postmasters? Is not that true in all the large cities of the United States?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Oh, no; I will say to my friend that it may reduce their work a little, but it does not reduce in any respect their responsibility. [Applause.]

Now, I must hurry on. There are included within the New York post-office organization five stations whose activities, personnel, and postal receipts equal, or surpass the postal business transacted by many large first-class cities. This may best be indicated by the following summary showing postal receipts for the year 1927, floor space occupied, and personnel assigned:

*City Hall Station*

Receipts	\$10,380,932
Floor space (square feet)	136,130
Personnel (employees)	1,674

Up to 1918 City Hall Station was the general post office.

The receipts are greater than those of Cleveland, Ohio, which is the eighth largest post office in the Postal Service.

Receipts are greater than those of Buffalo, N. Y., and Indianapolis, Ind., combined, and approximate the combined receipts of Toledo, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Richmond, Va.; Hartford, Conn.; and Memphis, Tenn.

*Grand Central Station*

Receipts	\$6,540,977
Floor space (square feet)	120,000
Personnel (employees)	2,400

Located, as its name implies, at the terminus of the New York Central and the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad lines, it is a keystone in the New York postal system.

The postal receipts compare favorably with those of Baltimore, Md., and exceed those of Minneapolis, Minn., Washington, D. C., and Milwaukee, Wis.

*Hudson Terminal Station*

Receipts	\$2,456,463
Floor space (square feet)	56,000
Personnel (employees)	1,400

This station is located in the Hudson Terminal Building with direct railway connection with the Pennsylvania lines via the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad.

This station is the distribution center for the down town financial district, and dispatches daily more than a million pieces of first-class mail.

*Madison Square Station*

Receipts	\$5,781,872
Floor space (square feet)	58,000
Personnel (employees)	900

This station is located in the most important commercial and industrial center. The postal receipts exceed those of Milwaukee, Wis.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Atlanta, Ga.; and Dallas, Tex., and are greater than the combined receipts of Louisville, Ky., and New Orleans, La.

*Varick Street Station*

Receipts	\$1,893,027
Floor space (square feet)	163,000
Personnel (employees)	1,100

The receipts are greater than those of Nashville, Tenn., or New Haven, Conn. There is no similar activity of such proportions in the Postal Service. Here are made up all mails intended for foreign countries. Mail is forwarded to Varick Street Station from all parts of the United States, and is distributed for final dispatch to the various countries.

Indicative of the growth in the volume of foreign business handled by the New York post office is the following comparative statement:

Number of sacks dispatched via steamships in 1927	1,557,054
Number of sacks dispatched via steamships in 1917	628,596

Increase of approximately 148 per cent or..... 928,458

During the period of one week, March 20 to 26, 1927, 32,960 sacks were dispatched to foreign countries via 57 different steamships. During the week of December 4 to 10, 1927, a total of 53,145 sacks were dispatched via 61 different steamships. The weekly average number of sacks dispatched aggregates

20,000, and the average number of steamships via which mail is forwarded weekly totals 56.

The motor-vehicle service requires more than 646 employees to maintain this branch of the service. There is maintained a complete overhaul and repair unit, which also provides mechanical service to 128 other post offices. The local fleet consists of 393 vehicles, which performed service of 3,411,066 miles in 1927.

Besides those units enumerated above, namely, City Hall Station, Grand Central Station, Hudson Terminal Station, Madison Square Station, and Varick Street Station, there are six other stations whose receipts are in excess of \$1,000,000 per annum, namely, Trinity Station, Station S, Station A, Station G, and Station P, and five whose receipts range from \$2,881,000 to \$4,313,076, namely Station D, Station V, West Forty-third Street Station, Wall Street Station, and Times Square Station.

The general post office is the executive and administrative headquarters of this great organization, and houses in addition to mail-handling activities the executive, administrative, and financial sections of the organization. The responsibility of all of these activities rests solely upon the postmaster.

The present postmaster, the Hon. John J. Kiely, is exceptionally well fitted for the position, having come up from the ranks of the service, and through assignment in an official capacity to practically all of the larger units referred to above, secured an experience and training which qualifies him admirably to administer efficiently and economically all of the varied activities of the New York post office.

Turning now to Brooklyn, my home city, which is an independent post office, with, of course, its own postmaster, the Hon. Albert Firmin, we find that Congress passed an act June 5, 1920, which fixed the salaries of all postmasters in first, second, and third class post offices; and while the postmasters of all the second and third class offices, and of some of the first-class offices received an increase of about \$200 each, the offices with receipts in excess of \$600,000 were not affected, except that an additional grade was provided for offices with receipts of \$7,000,000 and in excess of this sum, with compensation at \$8,000.

Again there was legislation in 1925, when Congress, upon February 28, 1925, gave some small increases to postmasters of the third class and to a few grades in the second class. The compensation of postmasters of large offices like New York and Brooklyn were not, however, increased.

The receipts of the Brooklyn post office last year were \$9,140,807.15. Brooklyn now ranks next to Chicago as to its population. Brooklyn is in fact the seventh city in the world as to population. It is credited by the Census Bureau in its estimate of July 1, 1927, with 2,274,400 people, or 459,000 more than Manhattan. The Brooklyn City post office also serves a section of Queens County, with possibly 100,000 additional patrons, and from these statistics you will perceive the transcendent importance of this great center of population over our other great cities. It is the most populous of all the boroughs making up New York City. Furthermore, it is growing with phenomenal speed. In excess of \$600,000 each working day is being expended at the present time for new buildings and alterations on old ones, and you can well perceive the burden this rapid development places upon the postal organization and how it adds to the responsibilities of the postmaster.

I have mentioned that the receipts of the Brooklyn office during the year just passed amounted to \$9,140,807, but this big sum by no means represents the full financial responsibility of the postmaster, and for which full responsibility he is bonded. The money-order transactions of the Brooklyn office I find, for instance, amounted last year to \$59,029,187, and it has \$6,299,666 on deposit in the postal savings.

I do not believe that there are any other industrial organizations in our Commonwealth with transactions of comparable volume and employing executives with comparable responsibilities which are paying so little. In our great industrial and financial institutions, few among which employ so many men or handle such large sums, it will be found that minor executives are paid more than we are paying these chief executives.

Contrasting the salaries of our postmasters in large post offices of the United States, the maximum grade of which is \$8,000, with the salaries paid in New York to our city officials—and I do not doubt but a similar comparison with other cities would produce like results—we find that the postmasters are sorely discriminated against. Our city pays the dock commissioner \$10,000; the chief civil-service commissioner, \$8,500; commissioner of correction, \$10,000; commissioner of accounts, \$10,000; commissioner of water supply, \$10,000; commissioner of health, \$10,000; commissioner of markets, \$10,000; director of budget, \$12,000; and secretary to the mayor, \$8,500.



I should add that while the duty of Congress is to fix compensation commensurate with the responsibility of the office—and it is the duty of the Executive to see that the positions are filled by those who measure up to the importance of the offices created—it is nevertheless of interest when we are discussing the problems involved to know that the present incumbents of these two offices are men who entered the service more than 40 years ago, starting at the lowest rungs of the postal ladder, and that they have as a result of assiduous application to duty, exemplary industry, and acknowledged efficiency climbed to the top. It is equally interesting to know that many other postmasters among those who would be benefited by this bill, in some of the chief offices of the United States, have likewise very fine records of the same kind, as, for instance, the postmaster at Philadelphia and Detroit.

In closing I would add that the Postal Service is one of the chief industries of the Nation. Upon its efficient management both our social and industrial relations and communications are very largely dependent. Any breakdown in the postal system would result in the paralysis of the country. Such men as I have referred to have devoted their lives to this business, which is our business, and it is a specialized work, so that if they abandon it they have no other market in which to offer the knowledge which they have acquired.

Under these circumstances and in view of the other facts submitted, it is only common justice to compensate them fairly for their services.

So long as the salaries fixed in 1875 and on these other remote dates I have named remain unchanged we are subject to grave reproach for permitting it. [Applause.]

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, after the illuminating address of my distinguished colleague from New York, I feel it is only proper and right that somebody from the city of New York and the Borough of Manhattan should say a word on behalf of the post office and the present incumbent of that office, and let the splendid work that is being done there be known throughout the country.

The present postmaster of the Borough of Manhattan of the city of New York is not of my political affiliation, but he is a gentleman who has administered the affairs of the post office for the past four and a half or five years and has brought it to the wonderful level it has now attained.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations asked my colleague if he wanted to raise this salary. I want to indorse with all the strength at my command the suggestion that his salary be raised, because Mr. John J. Kiely, now in active control of 18,000 men in the Post Office Department, an army in and of itself, where the distribution of mail is done in the most efficient manner known throughout the United States, should receive a salary commensurate with a man who commands an army or a man who commands a division of 18,000 men in the city of New York or anywhere throughout the United States. To say that this man should be kept at the present salary of \$8,000 a year, when he has been a postman all his life and a postmaster for the past four and a half or five years, is ridiculous.

I understand nothing can be done in this bill with reference to this particular salary, but the Sproul bill will accomplish what is sought to be done with respect to this matter.

Under the administration of Mr. Kiely pneumatic tubes have been placed throughout the city of New York and Brooklyn, and it is possible now to deliver a letter within the city of New York and within the Borough of Manhattan in a matter of two or three hours.

The time has come when we should recognize such efficient work, and we must recognize efficiency irrespective of party and irrespective of any other consideration. A man who is doing his work as splendidly as Mr. Kiely is in New York should receive recognition and his salary should be advanced. He should receive at least the sum of \$12,000 a year, and I will support the bill introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPROUL] which contemplates such an increase. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, under contract, and for the incidental expenses thereof including not to exceed \$30,000 for assistant superintendents and clerks at air mail transfer points, in accordance with the act approved February 2, 1925, and amended June 3, 1926, \$6,430,000: *Provided*, That \$19,100 of this appropriation shall be available for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia, incidental and travel expenses.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether the contracts for air mail meet the probable developments of the

air mail service in the coming fiscal year, and will the appropriation provide for a reasonable expansion of that service?

Mr. MADDEN. There is \$6,430,000 in this item. In addition to that there is an appropriation in the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for the development of airways, lighting, and so forth. There are 11,700 miles of air mail routes under contract; they are not all in operation and will not all be in operation until about the 1st of July.

The sum of \$6,000,000 was asked in the Budget for carrying air mail by contract. The committee thought they ought to have some leeway, and so we added \$430,000. I believe the department is satisfied.

The committee thinks that there ought to be great care exercised in the letting of contracts for air mail. They ought to be sure that there is air mail to be carried over the routes for which the contract is let. Otherwise you are not going to be able to get contractors. We are depending now on private citizens to bid for it, either as individuals or as members of corporations. It would be most unfortunate, it seems to the committee, if we should let contracts for air mail routes that turned out to be unprofitable.

Mr. BRIGGS. The committee, I understand, has the thought that in taking these contracts the contractor must be able to make a reasonable return. Otherwise there would not be sufficient interest in the service on the part of the contractor.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and we ought not to expand until we are reasonably certain of success.

Mr. BRIGGS. Except where they are an integral part of the air mail service throughout the country.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; there is money enough in the fund to meet any such emergency.

Mr. BRIGGS. In the contemplated reduction in the Air Mail Service from 10 cents to 5 cents a half ounce, does the gentleman expect an increase in revenue from that reduction?

Mr. MADDEN. The committee does.

Mr. BRIGGS. My own thought is that it will produce an increase in revenue.

Mr. MADDEN. It should, but experience has shown that whether rates will bring an increase in revenue is uncertain. Nobody can tell. The best test we had on a comparison of receipts and expenditures was for seven days last October, when the deficit was shown to be about \$850,000 on a yearly basis, but since that time there has been some growth. There was nothing included in that loss for the lighting of the airways which would add to the loss. But the air service is growing.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois stated in his opening speech that there were about six air mail routes showing a profit.

Mr. MADDEN. We were told that, but it is a question of how they keep their books, whether they charge off depreciation or whether they just balance receipts and expenses without any charge for depreciation.

Mr. BRIGGS. But the gentleman thinks there is a growing improvement?

Mr. MADDEN. There is a growing improvement, and it is encouraging.

Mr. BRIGGS. And the gentleman thinks that the reduction to 5 cents a half ounce will improve matters in revenue?

Mr. MADDEN. There is one thing that everybody ought to realize, and that is the Air Mail Service is not going to be self-sustaining without the cooperation of the public.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a statement of the contract Air Mail Service and the poundage rate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### CONTRACT AIR MAIL SERVICE

C. A. M. 1. Boston, Mass., via Hartford, Conn., to New York, N. Y., and return, 192 miles each way. Contract awarded October 7, 1925, to Colonial Air Transport (Inc.), 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., at \$3 per pound; service commenced July 1, 1926.

C. A. M. 2. Chicago, Ill., via Peoria and Springfield, Ill., to St. Louis, Mo., and return, 278 miles each way. Contract awarded October 7, 1925, to Robertson Aircraft Corporation, Anglum, Mo., at \$2.53125 per pound; service commenced April 15, 1926.

C. A. M. 3. Chicago, Ill., via Moline, Ill., St. Joseph and Kansas City, Mo., Wichita, Kans., Ponca City and Oklahoma City, Okla., to Fort Worth and Dallas, Tex., and return, 987 miles each way. Contract awarded October 7, 1925, to National Air Transport (Inc.), 506 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., at \$3 per pound; service commenced May 12, 1926.

C. A. M. 4. Salt Lake City, Utah, via Las Vegas, Nev., to Los Angeles, Calif., and return, 600 miles each way. Contract awarded October 7, 1925, to Western Air Express (Inc.), 113 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., at \$3 per pound; service commenced April 17, 1926.

C. A. M. 5. Salt Lake City, Utah, via Boise, Idaho, to Pasco, Wash., and return, 530 miles each way. Contract awarded October 7, 1925, to Walter T. Varney, post-office box 722, Boise, Idaho, at \$3 per pound; service commenced April 6, 1926.

C. A. M. 6. Detroit, Mich., to Cleveland, Ohio, and return, 91 miles each way. Contract awarded November 25, 1925, to Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich., at \$1.08 per pound; service commenced February 15, 1926.

C. A. M. 7. Detroit, Mich., to Chicago, Ill., and return, 237 miles each way. Contract awarded November 25, 1925, to Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich., at \$1.08 per pound; service commenced February 15, 1926.

C. A. M. 8. Seattle, Wash., via Portland and Medford, Oreg., San Francisco, Fresno, and Bakersfield, Calif., to Los Angeles, Calif., and return, 1,099 miles each way. Contract awarded December 31, 1925, to Pacific Air Transport (Inc.), 593 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., at \$2.8125 per pound; service commenced September 15, 1926.

C. A. M. 9. Chicago, Ill., via Milwaukee, Madison, and La Crosse, Wis., to St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., and return, 383 miles each way. Contract awarded January 11, 1926, and service commenced June 7, 1926; Northwest Airways (Inc.), St. Paul, Minn., present contractor at \$2.75 per pound.

C. A. M. 11. Cleveland, Ohio, via Youngstown, Ohio, and McKeesport, Pa., to Pittsburgh, Pa., and return, 123 miles each way. Contract awarded March 27, 1926, to Clifford Ball, 407 Market Street, McKeesport, Pa., at \$3 per pound; service commenced April 21, 1927.

C. A. M. 12. Cheyenne, Wyo., via Denver and Colorado Springs, Colo., to Pueblo, Colo., and return, 199 miles each way. Contract awarded March 29, 1926, and service commenced May 31, 1926; Western Air Express (Inc.), 113 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., present contractor, at \$0.83 per pound.

C. A. M. 16. Cleveland, Ohio, via Akron, Columbus, Dayton, and Cincinnati, Ohio, to Louisville, Ky., and return, 339 miles each way. Contract awarded October 10, 1927, to Continental Air Lines (Inc.), 1259 Union Trust Building, Cleveland, Ohio, at \$1.22 per pound; service not yet in operation.

C. A. M. 17. New York, N. Y., via Cleveland, Ohio, to Chicago, Ill., and return, 723 miles each way. Contract awarded April 2, 1927, to National Air Transport (Inc.), 506 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., at \$1.24 per pound; service commenced September 1, 1927.

C. A. M. 18. Chicago, Ill., via Iowa City and Des Moines, Iowa, Omaha and North Platte, Nebr., Cheyenne and Rock Springs, Wyo., Salt Lake City, Utah, Elko and Reno, Nev., and Sacramento to San Francisco, Calif., and return, 1,904 miles each way. Contract awarded January 29, 1927, to Boeing Air Transport (Inc.), Georgetown Station, Seattle, Wash., at \$1.50 per pound; service commenced July 1, 1927.

C. A. M. 19. New York, N. Y., via Philadelphia, Pa., Washington, D. C., Richmond, Va., Greensboro, N. C., and Spartanburg, S. C., to Atlanta, Ga., and return, 773 miles each way. Contract awarded February 28, 1927, to Pitcairn Aviation (Inc.), Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa., at \$3 per pound; service not yet in operation.

C. A. M. 20. Albany, N. Y., via Schenectady, Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, N. Y., to Cleveland, Ohio, and return, 452 miles each way. Contract awarded July 27, 1927, to Colonial Western Airways (Inc.), 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., at \$1.11 per pound; service commenced December 17, 1927.

C. A. M. 21. Dallas, via Houston, to Galveston, Tex., and return, 283 miles each way. Contract awarded August 17, 1927, to Texas Air Transport (Inc.), Fort Worth Club Building, Fort Worth, Tex., at \$2.89 per pound; service commenced February 6, 1928.

C. A. M. 22. Dallas, via Waco, Austin, and San Antonio, to Laredo, Tex., and return, 417 miles each way. Contract awarded August 17, 1927, to Texas Air Transport (Inc.), Fort Worth Club Building, Fort Worth, Tex., at \$2.89 per pound; service commenced February 6, 1928.

C. A. M. 23. Atlanta, Ga., via Birmingham and Mobile, Ala., to New Orleans, La., and return, 478 miles each way. Contract awarded August 19, 1927, to St. Tammany Gulf Coast Airways (Inc.), Room R, Mezzanine Floor, Roosevelt Hotel, New Orleans, La., at \$1.75 per pound; service not yet in operation.

C. A. M. 24. Chicago, Ill., via Indianapolis, Ind., to Cincinnati, Ohio, and return, 270 miles each way. Contract awarded November 15, 1927, to Embury-Riddle Co., Lunken Airport, Cincinnati, Ohio, at \$1.47 per pound; service commenced December 17, 1927.

C. A. M. 25. Atlanta, Ga., via Jacksonville, to Miami, Fla., and return, 595 miles each way. Contract awarded November 23, 1927, to Pitcairn Aviation (Inc.), Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa., at \$1.46 per pound; service not yet in operation.

C. A. M. 26. Great Falls, via Helena and Butte, Mont., and Pocatello, Idaho, to Salt Lake City, Utah, and return, 493 miles each way. Contract awarded December 30, 1927, to Alfred Frank, Salt Lake City, Utah, at \$2.475 per pound; service not yet in operation.

## FOREIGN MAIL ROUTES

F. M. 2. Seattle, Wash., to Victoria, British Columbia, and return, 84 miles each way. Contract awarded May 23, 1927, to Northwest Air Service (Inc.), care of postmaster, Seattle, Wash., at \$190 per round trip; service commenced July 1, 1927.

F. M. 3. New Orleans to Pilottown, La., and return, 80 miles each way. Contract awarded May 21, 1927, to Arthur E. Cambas, 4322 Burgundy Street, New Orleans, La., at \$110 per round trip; service commenced July 1, 1927.

F. M. 4. Key West, Fla., to Habana, Cuba, 90 miles one way (Cuban mail carried on return trip). Contract awarded July 19, 1927, to Pan American Airways (Inc.), 50 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., at 40½ cents per pound; service commenced October 19, 1927.

The Clerk read as follows:

## OFFICE OF THE THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

For manufacture of adhesive postage stamps, special-delivery stamps, books of stamps, stamped envelopes, newspaper wrappers, postal cards, and for colling of stamps, \$7,950,000.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Under what arrangement does the Government procure printed stamped envelopes?

Mr. MADDEN. The Government has a contract for printing stamped envelopes, which will expire next year. I think not more than \$30,000 on a whole year's supply.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Government entering into any activity that is not a necessary function of Government.

This appropriation is necessary to fulfill the Government's annual payment under its four-year contract for stamped envelopes with return notice, and so forth. I do not oppose this appropriation for the sole reason that I want the Government to live up to its contract, but I am opposed to the renewal of that contract when it expires and serve notice that I shall fight any extension as unwise in principle.

There is no reason for the Government to appropriate money to carry on any business that is not a necessary function of government. I am opposed to any appropriation to permit the Government to go into either the printing or the stationery business. The statement is made, and perhaps it is correct, that by this method the users of this character of printed stationery may acquire it cheaper than from private sources. It is also stated that this will therefore benefit a large number of people and adversely affect only a few. This statement is also no doubt true. Yet, conceding the truth of both statements, are we justified in this intrusion of the Government into a legitimate field of private business which is not a necessary function of government?

I have received many letters from my district which are inspired by the chamber of commerce of the city (Dayton, Ohio) which has the monopoly of doing this printing for the Government. This fact is not disclosed in the letters. These letter writers all favor the continuance of the custom. One of these letters to me is from a shoe merchant in my district, who says that he can buy his stationery much cheaper this way, and if the Government did not do this work only a few printers would be benefited thereby. I concede this also to be true, yet still is it wise for the Government to do this printing?

Is it not the purpose of government to protect the rights of the few as well as the rights of the many? I suggested to the shoe merchant that if the Government went into the shoe business and manufactured millions of pairs of shoes it would probably furnish them to the wearers of shoes cheaper than they are now buying them, and only a few shoe merchants would suffer therefrom. This also would apply with equal force to countless other phases of private business, and if for that reason alone the Government did invade many fields of private business the final result would be that there would be no business outside of the Government.

Regardless of the great number benefited and the small number prejudiced, I see no more reason for the Government to go into the stationery and printing business than into the shoe business or any other unnecessary business. I am therefore opposed to the principle of appropriating for this activity.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of rural carriers, auxiliary carriers, substitutes for rural carriers on annual and sick leave, clerks in charge of rural stations, and tolls and ferriage, Rural Delivery Service, and for the incidental expenses thereof, \$106,000,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is the appropriation provided here for rural carrier service adequate to meet all demands?

Mr. MADDEN. The appropriation is \$106,000,000. There are 38 applications pending for new routes. They will all be adjudicated and most of them, I presume, will be put into



service. There are about 1,100 applications for changes in existing routes and all of those will be adjusted. There never has been a better situation in respect to the rural service than that which exists to-day. They have plenty of money here, every one admits, with no piling up of applications that are undisposed of.

Mr. BRIGGS. And this provides for a reasonable expansion of that service?

Mr. MADDEN. It provides for all of the expansion requested.

Mr. BRIGGS. Some will come in with the current fiscal year.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. And this provides for meeting that situation as well as for pending applications?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And the Post Office Department, especially the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, will not be able to answer that it can not furnish new service where it is needed because it has not the money.

Mr. MADDEN. It will not be justified in making that excuse.

Mr. BLANTON. Because the committee has given it all it requested along that line?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Those civilian positions in the field services under the several executive departments and independent establishments, the compensation of which was fixed or limited by law but adjusted for the fiscal year 1925 under the authority and appropriations contained in the act entitled "An act making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, to enable the heads of the several executive departments and independent establishments to adjust the rates of compensation of civilian employees in certain of the field services," approved December 6, 1924, may be paid under the applicable appropriations for the fiscal year 1929 at rates not in excess of those permitted for them under the provisions of such act of December 6, 1924.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 31, line 24, after the figures "1929," insert "and thereafter."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about what this means, I wish to say that we have carried this language for years. It is necessary from year to year. What this language proposes is now being done, and if this amendment is adopted we will not be required to carry the language in the future, because it will then be permanent law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The head of an executive department or independent establishment, where, in his judgment, conditions of employment require it, may continue to furnish civilians employed in the field service with quarters, heat, light, household equipment, subsistence, and laundry service; and appropriations for the fiscal year 1929 of the character heretofore used for such purposes are hereby made available therefore: *Provided*, That the reasonable value of such allowances shall be determined and considered as part of the compensation in fixing the salary rate of such civilians.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "therefore," in line 10, on page 82, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "therefor."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have a further amendment, which I desire to offer on that paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 82, line 8, after the figures "1929," insert "and thereafter."

Mr. MADDEN. This is similar to the amendment just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10635) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. When is the proper time to move to recommit the bill?

The SPEAKER. After the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on ordering the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 324, nays 10, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—324

Ackerman	Crall	Hastings	Milligan
Adkins	Cramton	Haugen	Montague
Allen	Crisp	Hawley	Mooney
Allgood	Cullen	Hersey	Moore, Ky.
Almon	Curry	Hickey	Moore, N. J.
Andrew	Dallinger	Hill, Ala.	Moore, Ohio
Arentz	Darrow	Hill, Wash.	Moore, Va.
Arnold	Davenport	Hoch	Morehead
Aswell	Davis	Hoffman	Morgan
Auf der Heide	Denison	Hogg	Morrow
Ayres	De Rouen	Holaday	Murphy
Bachmann	Dickinson, Iowa	Hooper	Nelson, Me.
Bacon	Dickstein	Hope	Nelson, Mo.
Barbour	Doughton	Houston, Del.	Newton
Beedy	Douglass, Mass.	Howard, Okla.	Niedringhaus
Beers	Doutrich	Howard, Nebr.	Norton, Nebr.
Begg	Doyle	Huddleston	O'Brien
Bell	Drane	Hudspeth	O'Connell
Berger	Drewry	Hughes	O'Connor, La.
Black, Tex.	Driver	Hull, Morton D.	Oldfield
Bland	Dyer	Hull, William E.	Oliver, Ala.
Blanton	Eaton	Irwin	Oliver, N. Y.
Bloom	Edwards	Jeffers	Parker
Bowles	Elliott	Jenkins	Parks
Bowling	England	Johnson, Ill.	Peery
Bowman	Englebright	Johnson, Ind.	Perkins
Box	Eslick	Johnson, Okla.	Pou
Boylan	Evans, Calif.	Johnson, Tex.	Prall
Brand, Ga.	Evans, Mont.	Johnson, Wash.	Pratt
Brand, Ohio	Fenn	Jones	Quin
Briggs	Fisher	Kahn	Ragon
Brigham	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Kearns	Rainey
Browne	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Kelly	Ramsayer
Browning	Fitzpatrick	Kemp	Rankin
Buchanan	Fletcher	Kerr	Ransley
Buckbee	Fort	Ketcham	Rayburn
Bulwinkle	French	Kiess	Reece
Burtness	Frothingham	Kincheloe	Reed, N. Y.
Burton	Fulbright	Kopp	Reid, Ill.
Busby	Fulmer	Korell	Robinson, Iowa
Bushong	Furlow	Kvale	Robison, Ky.
Butler	Gallivan	LaGuardia	Rogers
Byrns	Gambrill	Lanham	Romjue
Campbell	Garber	Lankford	Rowbottom
Canfield	Gardner, Ind.	Leech	Ruby
Cannon	Garner, Tex.	Lehibach	Rutherford
Carew	Garrett, Tenn.	Letts	Sanders, N. Y.
Carley	Garrett, Tex.	Lindsay	Sanders, Tex.
Carss	Gasque	Lowrey	Sandlin
Carter	Gibson	Lozier	Schneider
Cartwright	Gifford	Luce	Sears, Nebr.
Casey	Gilbert	McClintic	Seger
Chalmers	Glynn	McKeown	Shreve
Chapman	Golder	McLaughlin	Simmons
Chindblom	Goldsbrough	McLeod	Sinclair
Christopherson	Goodwin	McReynolds	Sinnot
Clague	Gregory	McSwain	Sirovich
Clarke	Green, Fla.	McSweeney	Speaks
Cochran, Mo.	Greenwood	Madden	Spearing
Cochran, Pa.	Griest	Magrady	Sproul, Ill.
Cohen	Griffin	Major, Ill.	Sproul, Kans.
Cole, Iowa	Guyer	Major, Mo.	Steele
Collier	Hale	Manlove	Stevenson
Collins	Hall, Ill.	Mansfield	Summers, Wash.
Colton	Hall, Ind.	Mapes	Summers, Tex.
Combs	Hall, N. Dak.	Martin, Mass.	Swank
Connolly, Pa.	Hammer	Mead	Swick
Cooper, Ohio	Hancock	Menges	Swing
Cooper, Wis.	Hardy	Merritt	Taber
Corning	Hare	Mitchener	Tarver
Cox	Harrison	Miller	

Tatgenhorst	Vestal	Welch, Calif.	Wilson, La.
Taylor, Tenn.	Vincent, Mich.	Weller	Winter
Temple	Vinson, Ga.	Welsh, Pa.	Wolverton
Thatcher	Vinson, Ky.	White, Kans.	Woodruff
Thurston	Wainwright	White, Me.	Woodrum
Tillman	Ware	Whitehead	Wright
Tilson	Warren	Whittington	Wurzbach
Underhill	Wason	Williams, Ill.	Wyant
Underwood	Watres	Williams, Mo.	Yates
Updike	Weaver	Williams, Tex.	Zihlman

## NAYS—10

Beck, Wis.	Deal	Peavey	Tinkham
Black, N. Y.	Kading	Schafer	
Clancy	Linthicum	Somers, N. Y.	

## NOT VOTING—99

Abernethy	Fish	Leatherwood	Selvig
Aldrich	Foss	Leavitt	Shallenberger
Andresen	Frear	Lyon	Smith
Anthony	Free	McDuffie	Snell
Bacharach	Freeman	McFadden	Stalker
Bankhead	Graham	McMillan	Steagall
Beck, Pa.	Green, Iowa	MacGregor	Stedman
Bohn	Hadley	Maas	Stobbs
Boies	Hudson	Martin, La.	Strong, Kans.
Britten	Hull, Tenn.	Michaelson	Strong, Pa.
Burdick	Igoe	Monast	Strother
Celler	Jacobstein	Moorman	Sullivan
Chase	James	Morin	Taylor, Colo.
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson, Wis.	Thompson
Connery	Kendall	Norton, N. J.	Timberlake
Crosser	Kent	O'Connor, N. Y.	Treadway
Crowther	Kindred	Palmer	Tucker
Davey	King	Palmisano	Watson
Dempsey	Knutson	Porter	White, Colo.
Dickinson, Mo.	Kunz	Purnell	Williamson
Dominick	Kurtz	Quayle	Willson, Miss.
Douglas, Ariz.	Lampert	Rathbone	Wingo
Dowell	Langley	Reed, Ark.	Wood
Estep	Larsen	Sabath	Yon
Faust	Lea	Sears, Fla.	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Faust with Mr. McDuffie.  
 Mr. Porter with Mr. Kindred.  
 Mr. Free with Mr. Dominick.  
 Mr. Rathbone with Mr. Connally of Texas.  
 Mr. Snell with Mr. Bankhead.  
 Mr. Graham with Mr. Davey.  
 Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Igoe.  
 Mr. Hudson with Mrs. Norton of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Reed of Arkansas.  
 Mr. Lampert with Mr. White of Colorado.  
 Mr. Treadway with Mr. Steagall.  
 Mr. Purnell with Mr. Connery.  
 Mr. Morin with Mr. Sullivan.  
 Mr. Maas with Mr. Tucker.  
 Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Dickinson of Missouri.  
 Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Celler.  
 Mr. Crowther with Mr. Wingo.  
 Mr. Dowell with Mr. Larsen.  
 Mr. Fish with Mr. Moorman.  
 Mr. McFadden with Mr. Palmisano.  
 Mr. Leavitt with Mr. Yon.  
 Mr. Britten with Mr. Crosser.  
 Mr. Anthony with Mr. Cresser.  
 Mr. Beck of Pennsylvania with Mr. Shallenberger.  
 Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Abernethy.  
 Mr. Frear with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Green of Iowa with Mr. Jacobstein.  
 Mr. Kendall with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.  
 Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'Connor of New York.  
 Mr. Watson with Mr. Lyon.  
 Mr. Stobbs with Mr. Quayle.  
 Mr. Smith with Mr. Sabath.  
 Mr. Palmer with Mr. Stedman.  
 Mr. Chase with Mr. Kunz.  
 Mr. Burdick with Mr. Lea.  
 Mr. Foss with Mr. Kent.  
 Mr. Hadley with Mr. Martin of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Freeman with Mr. Sears of Florida.  
 Mr. King with Mr. McMillan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LINTHICUM moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to forthwith report the same back to the House with the following amendment: Add to the end of the bill the following as a new section:

"That no money herein appropriated for the enforcement of the national prohibition act shall be used in the preparation or issue of any permit for the removal or use of any industrial alcohol known to be denatured by any deadly poisonous drug."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on the motion to recommit, that it is legislation sought to be placed without authority on an appropriation bill, in that it seeks to change the existing law, the law having been for the past 25 years that permits can be issued to remove such alcohol where it contains poisonous substances; and it seeks also to interfere with the discretion of executive officers in the performance of their duty.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to inquire if this is the same amendment that was offered yesterday?

Mr. BLANTON. Either the same or it substantially. Mr. Speaker GILLET in several instances corrected wrong rulings that were inadvertently made in Committee of the Whole. I call the attention of the Chair to one in particular where Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole had held for many years that the garden-seed provision on an appropriation bill was in order; and yet, when the matter came up before the Speaker the Speaker stated that, although that holding had been held in the Committee of the Whole repeatedly, he felt it his duty to exercise proper consideration of the question, and that if he could not agree with the position of the Chairman of the committee, he was constrained not to follow it. And he sustained the point of order. I am appealing now to the judgment of the present Speaker of the House. This is a change of law, and an interference with the proper discretion that an executive officer should have in the performance of his duty.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not present yesterday when this question was ruled on in Committee of the Whole, but the Chair understands that the amendment is practically the same. The Chair has read the debate and read the decision of the Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and thinks that the decision was quite correct. He therefore overrules the point of order. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that, in the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland demands a division.

Mr. CAREW. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-eight Members have risen—a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are ordered. As many as are in favor of the motion to recommit will, when their names are called, answer "yea," those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 61, nays 283, not voting 89, as follows:

## [Roll No. 33]

## YEAS—61

Auf der Heide	Deal	Lehlbach	Prall
Beck, Wis.	De Rouen	Lindsay	Ransley
Berger	Dickstein	Linthicum	Sabath
Black, N. Y.	Douglass, Mass.	McLeod	Schafer
Bloom	Doyle	Martin, La.	Schneider
Boylan	Drewry	Mead	Sirovich
Britten	Englebright	Merritt	Somers, N. Y.
Carew	Fitzpatrick	Mooney	Spearing
Carley	Gallivan	Moore, N. J.	Tatgenhorst
Clancy	Gambrell	Niedringhaus	Tinkham
Cochran, Mo.	Glynn	O'Connor, La.	Ware
Cohen	Griffin	O'Connell	Welch, Calif.
Combs	Hancock	Oliver, N. Y.	Weller
Connolly, Pa.	Irwin	Palmisano	
Corning	Kading	Peavey	
Cullen	Kahn	Porter	

## NAYS—283

Ackerman	Begg	Burdick	Clarke
Adkins	Bell	Burtness	Cochran, Pa.
Aldrich	Black, Tex.	Burton	Cole, Iowa
Allen	Bland	Bushong	Collier
Allgood	Blanton	Butler	Collins
Almon	Bowles	Byrns	Colton
Andresen	Bowling	Campbell	Cooper, Wis.
Andrew	Bowman	Canfield	Cox
Arentz	Box	Cannon	Crall
Arnold	Brand, Ga.	Carss	Cramton
Aswell	Brand, Ohio	Carter	Crisp
Ayres	Briggs	Cartwright	Crowther
Bacharach	Brigham	Casey	Curry
Bachmann	Browne	Chalmers	Dallinger
Bacon	Browning	Chapman	Darrow
Barbour	Buchanan	Chindblom	Davenport
Beedy	Buckbee	Christopherson	Davis
Beers	Bulwinkle	Clague	Denison



Dickinson, Iowa	Hastings	Magrady	Sinnott
Dickinson, Mo.	Haugen	Major, Ill.	Speaks
Doughton	Hawley	Major, Mo.	Sprout, Ill.
Doutrich	Hersey	Manlove	Sprout, Kans.
Drane	Hickey	Mapes	Steele
Driver	Hill, Ala.	Martin, Mass.	Stevenson
Dyer	Hill, Wash.	Menges	Strong, Kans.
Eaton	Hoch	Michener	Summers, Wash.
Edwards	Hoffman	Miller	Summers, Tex.
Elliott	Hogg	Milligan	Swank
England	Holaday	Montague	Sweet
Eslick	Hooper	Moore, Ky.	Swick
Evans, Calif.	Hope	Moore, Ohio	Taber
Evans, Mont.	Houston, Del.	Moore, Va.	Tarver
Fenn	Howard, Nebr.	Morehead	Taylor, Tenn.
Fisher	Howard, Okla.	Morgan	Temple
Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Huddleston	Morrow	Thatcher
Fitzgerald, W. T.	Hudspeth	Murphy	Thurston
Fletcher	Hughes	Nelson, Me.	Tillman
Fort	Hull, Morton D.	Nelson, Mo.	Tilson
Frear	Hull, Wm. E.	Newton	Timberlake
French	Hull, Tenn.	Norton, Nebr.	Treadway
Frothingham	Jeffers	O'Brien	Underhill
Fulbright	Jenkins	Oldfield	Underwood
Fulmer	Johnson, Ind.	Oliver, Ala.	Udike
Furlow	Johnson, Okla.	Parker	Vestal
Garber	Johnson, Tex.	Parks	Vincent, Mich.
Gardner, Ind.	Johnson, Wash.	Peery	Vinson, Ga.
Garner, Tex.	Jones	Pratt	Vinson, Ky.
Garrett, Tenn.	Kearns	Quin	Walnwright
Garrett, Tex.	Kelly	Ragon	Watren
Gasque	Kemp	Rainey	Wason
Gibson	Kerr	Ramseyer	Watres
Gifford	Ketcham	Rankin	Watson
Gilbert	Kless	Rayburn	Weaver
Golder	Kincheloe	Reece	Welsh, Pa.
Goldsborough	Kopp	Reed, N. Y.	White, Kans.
Goodwin	Korell	Reid, Ill.	White, Me.
Gregory	Kvale	Robinson, Iowa	Whitehead
Green, Fla.	LaGuardia	Robison, Ky.	Whittington
Green, Iowa	Lanham	Rogers	Williams, Ill.
Greenwood	Lankford	Romjue	Williams, Mo.
Griest	Leech	Rowbottom	Williams, Tex.
Guyer	Letts	Rubey	Wilson, La.
Hadley	Lowrey	Rutherford	Wilson, Miss.
Hale	Lozier	Sanders, N. Y.	Winter
Hall, Ill.	Luce	Sanders, Tex.	Wolverton
Hall, Ind.	McClintic	Sandlin	Woodruff
Hall, N. Dak.	McKeown	Seger	Woodrum
Hammer	McLaughlin	Selvig	Wright
Hardy	McReynolds	Shreve	Wyant
Hare	McSweeney	Simmons	Yates
Harrison	Madden	Sinclair	

## NOT VOTING—89

Abernethy	Freeman	McFadden	Smith
Anthony	Graham	McMillan	Snell
Bankhead	Hudson	McSwain	Stalker
Beck, Pa.	Igoe	MacGregor	Steagall
Bohn	Jacobstein	Maas	Stedman
Boles	James	Mansfield	Stobbs
Busby	Johnson, Ill.	Michaelson	Strong, Pa.
Celler	Johnson, S. Dak.	Monast	Strother
Chase	Kendall	Moorman	Sullivan
Connally, Tex.	Kent	Morin	Swing
Connery	Kindred	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper, Ohio	King	Norton, N. J.	Thompson
Crosser	Knutson	O'Connor, N. Y.	Tucker
Davey	Kunz	Palmer	White, Colo.
Dempsey	Kurtz	Perkins	Williamson
Dominick	Lampert	Pou	Wingo
Douglas, Ariz.	Langley	Purnell	Wood
Dowell	Larsen	Quayle	Wurzbach
Estep	Lea	Rathbone	Yon
Faust	Leatherwood	Reed, Ark.	Zihlman
Fish	Leavitt	Sears, Fla.	
Foss	Lyon	Sears, Nebr.	
Free	McDuffie	Shallenberger	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kindred (for) with Mr. McDuffie (against).  
 Mr. Quayle (for) with Mr. Bankhead (against).  
 Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Moorman (against).  
 Mr. Kunz (for) with Mr. Pou (against).  
 Mr. Connery (for) with Mr. Leavitt (against).  
 Mr. Celler (for) with Mr. Johnson of Illinois (against).  
 Mr. White of Colorado (for) with Mr. Snell (against).  
 Mr. O'Connor of New York (for) with Mr. Stalker (against).  
 Mrs. Norton of New Jersey (for) with Mr. Purnell (against).  
 Mr. Crosser (for) with Mr. Smith (against).  
 Mr. Graham (for) with Mr. Dominick (against).  
 Mr. MacGregor (for) with Mr. McMillan (against).  
 Mr. Beck of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Steagall (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Mansfield.  
 Mr. Faust with Mr. Abernethy.  
 Mr. Kendall with Mr. Connally of Texas.  
 Mr. McFadden with Mr. Igoe.  
 Mr. Fish with Mr. Larsen.  
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Reed of Arkansas.  
 Mr. Stobbs with Mr. Davey.  
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Sears of Florida.  
 Mr. Freeman with Mr. Lea.  
 Mr. Palmer with Mr. Jacobstein.  
 Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kent.  
 Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Lyon.  
 Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Shallenberger.  
 Mrs. Langley with Mr. Stedman.  
 Mr. James with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Hudson with Mr. Wingo.  
 Mr. Free with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.  
 Mr. Dowell with Mr. Yon.

Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] is unavoidably absent. If he were present he would vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MADDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## THE LATE STANYARNE WILSON

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that on yesterday, at Spartanburg, S. C., Hon. Stanyarne Wilson, a Member of this House for six years from the fourth South Carolina district, died.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the order of business for tomorrow will be the Underhill general claims bill, which is the unfinished business on the calendar. The District appropriation bill is not ready for consideration to-morrow, and as the unfinished business on the calendar is the general claims bill, it will go on to-morrow.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There is some notion that other bills reported by the Claims Committee may come up to-morrow. Is that so?

Mr. TILSON. It is not the intention to take up the Private Calendar.

## BRIDGES ACROSS THE TUG FORK OF BIG SANDY RIVER

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call up Senate bill 2348, now on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up a Senate bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 2348) granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. and Knox Creek Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate two bridges across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River, near Devon, Mingo County, W. Va.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, in this connection I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker. It is the same inquiry I submitted yesterday afternoon to the Acting Speaker [Mr. TILSON]. When a Senate bill has been passed by the Senate and is messaged over to the House and is lying off the Speaker's table, and a similar bill, or a bill substantially similar, has been reported by a House committee, it is proper under the rules to move to take the Senate bill from the Speaker's table and consider it in the House. The question I wish to present is, does the same rule apply where the House bill has not only been reported by the House committee but has been passed by the House and sent over to the Senate? When I propounded my inquiry yesterday afternoon there was some discussion about the matter, and there appeared quite a difference of opinion respecting it among several of our best parliamentarians, although the Acting Speaker [Mr. TILSON] seemed to be practically sure that the rule would apply in such a case just the same as if the House bill had been reported but not passed. I would like to present that inquiry to the Speaker before this bill is acted upon, in order that there may be a ruling of the present Speaker and the question may be definitely settled for the guidance of Members when similar questions hereafter arise.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has read the debate on that question, not being present yesterday. The Chair remembers that a short time ago the present occupant of the chair was about to make a ruling on the subject sustaining the right to call up a bill under these circumstances. However, at that time the gentleman calling up the bill changed his request to one of unanimous consent, so it was not necessary for the Chair to pass directly upon the question. The Chair, however, has before him a precisely similar situation which developed in the third session of the Sixty-second Congress, where a question arose as to whether a Senate bill could be called up as a matter of right when a similar House bill had been passed. Speaker Clark, in ruling on that question, decided, in substance, that the situation, in so far as the House bill was concerned, was the same whether it had been merely reported or had actually passed. Speaker Clark held that the same rule applied, and the present occupant of the chair, having been of that opinion hitherto and being reinforced by this ruling of Speaker Clark, has no hesitation in ruling that such a bill may be called up as a matter of right.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has formally authorized me to make this motion, and therefore I renew the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would be proper, under the circumstances, to request the Senate to return the House bill. That was done in this previous case.

Mr. DENISON. I was either going to do that, Mr. Speaker, or request them to table it or postpone its consideration indefinitely.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will take charge of that.

Mr. DENISON. Yes; I will attend to that.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. QUAYLE, for an indefinite period, on account of undergoing an operation in a Brooklyn hospital.

Mr. GIBSON, for five days, on account of important business.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

#### THE VOLSTEAD ACT

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday, and therefore I have to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of poisoned whisky.

Mr. SCHAFER. Reserving the right to object, are these remarks a post-mortem?

Mr. BERGER. A post-mortem about the gentleman, because I consider him "poisoned." [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have introduced a bill to legalize the manufacture and sale of light wines and beers.

Now, let me define, first, what is understood by light wines. Light wines are those containing 12 per cent or less of alcohol. And beer is the usual beverage of barley and hops with an alcoholic content of 4 per cent or less.

#### VOLSTEAD LAW IS MAKING OUR NATION A "HARD-LIQUOR" NATION

My reason for introducing that bill, above all, is the fact that the Volstead Act is arbitrary, unscientific, and nonsensical, and that it can not be effectively enforced under present conditions.

Furthermore, also, that the eight years of attempted enforcement of the Volstead Act have brought about disastrous consequences to the morale of our country. During these eight years crime has increased and drunkenness has increased. The reason for that is simple. Beer and light wines can not be obtained readily, but one can get whisky. People bought and used whisky which they got from bootleggers.

The kind of whisky people can get, however, is inferior and harmful and instills poisons in hundreds of thousands of our people, especially, also, of our young people.

Since we have prohibition our Nation has not only become a Nation of home-brewers, making inferior beer to take the place of the good old beer that we had in the past, but, what is worse, our people drink again "hard liquor." And that is a great pity, since in 1917 we were just on the point of getting used to light wines and beers.

#### CREATING "LAW JAMS"

One of the worst aspects of the Volstead Act is that violations of law have ceased to be regarded as crimes. Violations are so common that the Federal courts are congested with liquor cases. The beginning of 1928 has seen one of the worst law jams and court congestions in the history of the country.

Prohibition cases are chiefly responsible for that. At the present time criminal litigation alone, based on violations of the Volstead Act, represent more than 50 per cent of all the criminal litigation in the Federal courts.

And another feature of this is that fully 15,000 dry cases must be nolle prossed by Federal district attorneys because the Government's evidence has collapsed.

I shall submit a table showing the record, by years, of Volstead law arrests and prosecutions, which will give a view of court congestion.

#### SPYING IS A JOB NEITHER DECENT NOR HONORABLE

And since the Volstead Act is a bad act, it naturally needs "bad actors" to enforce it.

When prohibition was getting under way a suggestion was made in Congress to select all the agents by civil service. The late Wayne B. Wheeler, however, objected strenuously. He and his Anti-Saloon crowd wanted a hand-picked crew—and having full sway in Congress—Congress let Wayne B. Wheeler have his way.

The result was a bad failure. Therefore lately the Anti-Saloon League began to clamor for a civil-service examination, which the old force had also to undergo. And although the test was not scholastic and had nothing to do with book learning—and the questions were very simple, practical questions—75 per cent of the present 2,000 supervisors, inspectors, and agents of the Federal prohibition enforcers were unable to pass the examination.

The failure of these men to pass so simple an examination caused considerable comment all over the country.

But that result can also be explained very readily.

The service under the Volstead Act is one which in the main appeals only to persons of a low grade of intelligence or those who can not find any other jobs. "High-brow" prohibition agents—which in this case would mean prohibition agents who can read and use common, everyday intelligence—would perhaps be all right if the job they were called upon to do was either decent or honorable.

#### CELLAR SNOOPER KNOWS LESS THAN EIGHTH-GRADE BOY

As everyone knows, however, the prohibition agent, with few exceptions, is rarely asked to do anything that is decent or honorable. Most of his time he is supposed to spend snooping on his neighbors and otherwise make a nuisance of himself. And not a small part of his time he must spend making a hash of the spirit, if not of the letter, of the Constitution of the United States under the pretext of enforcing the eighteenth amendment.

And thus the Prohibition Bureau begot a crowd three-quarters of which could not pass an examination, which any boy or girl who has finished the eighth grade in a public school would easily pass. Out of a force of 2,000 men three-quarters of those spies and cellar snoopers failed to qualify in that examination.

So much for this side of the question.

#### PLEASE LOOK AT THE MONEY SPENT

But now as to the other side.

National prohibition finished the eighth year of its existence on January 16, 1928.

The financial outlay by the Federal Government for the enforcement of this act during the eight years follows:

Prohibition Unit.....	\$75, 716, 860
Coast Guard, approximate.....	70, 000, 000
Department of Justice, approximate.....	32, 000, 000
Total.....	177, 716, 860

Nor is that all.

#### AND LOOK AT THE INCOME LOST

There has been, on the other hand, a definite loss in revenues that the Government derived from spirits and beers. These amounted to \$483,050,854.47 in 1919 and \$443,389,544.98 in 1918.

In the eight years before 1918 the internal-revenue receipts from these sources were:

1910.....	\$201, 008, 670. 88
1911.....	211, 804, 579. 55
1912.....	212, 042, 339. 92
1913.....	223, 314, 452. 21
1914.....	226, 179, 689. 76
1915.....	223, 948, 646. 09
1916.....	247, 453, 543. 52
1917.....	284, 008, 512. 62

This was an increase from 1910 to 1917 of more than \$80,000,000 in annual receipts. Discounting the two abnormal years of taxes collected and assuming that the eight years from 1920 to 1928 would have seen a like increase in these revenues, the total that might now be expected if prohibition had not come would be close to \$350,000,000 or more a year.

#### FIGURES PROVING DRUNKENNESS STEADILY ON THE INCREASE

And the most significant result is that drunkenness has increased continuously.

Drunkenness increased almost as fast in 1926 as it did in 1925 and somewhat faster than it did in 1924.

The 602 cities and towns reporting arrests for drunkenness showed an increase from 650,961 in 1924 to 687,812 in 1925 and 711,889 in 1926. I have no figures for 1927 as yet.

In 534 cities and towns arrests for drunkenness in 1926 increased 136 per cent above 1920—above the first year of national prohibition.



In 403 cities and towns reporting for 1914 to 1926, arrests for drunkenness in 1926 were higher than in any previous year with the one exception of the war-boom peak of 1916. The 1916 peak was 563,792 for drunkenness, and 1926 almost reached that peak year, being 559,074.

#### MORE DRUNKENNESS IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL THAN EVER

Intoxication in Washington, the National Capital, has apparently risen to new high altitudes. At any rate, all previous records for commitments to the District of Columbia Jail for intoxication were shattered in the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1927, according to the annual report of the superintendent of the institution submitted to the District of Columbia Commissioners. The largest total commitment for a single offense in the year was for intoxication.

The report pointed out that intoxication accounted for 49.2 per cent of the total for all offenses for which prisoners were committed to the jail, and that the intoxication cases, which numbered 5,874, exceeded by 820 the number of prisoners sent to jail for the same offense in the preceding year.

Conditions in the former so-called dry States are very much worse to-day as compared with 1914 than are conditions in the so-called wet States. In the dry States the number of arrests for drunkenness went up sharply in 1926 and exceeded any year heretofore.

#### REPORT OF FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ON DRINKING AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE

But the most distressing result of the Volstead Act has been the increase in drinking among boys and girls and young people generally. There have been reports to this effect in the press so constantly from all over the United States that the matter has become common knowledge.

The Federal Council of Churches in its investigation of the subject sent questionnaires to 2,700 social workers, who, as a class, are prejudiced in favor of prohibition. Yet the great majority of the replies received stated that they observed more drinking by young people than in preprohibition times. Sheriffs and chiefs of police of towns and district attorneys give similar testimony.

The attorney general of South Dakota, a dry State before prohibition, said:

There is a strange psychology about this liquor problem that makes it doubly significant. It is beginning to affect a different type of persons than it did before. Now it is the youngster of the family of means who is toting the bottle. The boy thinks it is smart to have a bottle on the hip, and the girls encourage the boys to do it. And they rush about in cars. It is one of the most menacing phases of the whole situation.

#### RAISING A NEW CROP OF DRUNKARDS

While there is not much authoritative statistics as yet upon the subject of drunkenness among the young, apparently the largest increase has taken place among those from 15 to 25 years of age.

The Police Department of Washington, D. C., has classified the arrests for drunkenness by ages, and its figures are illuminating. These official figures completely confirm the other evidence on the subject as to the Nation on the whole and leave no doubt that there has been a very considerable increase in drunkenness among the young. This can only mean that each year we are raising a new crop of drunkards which is much larger than the annual crop we used to raise under the saloon.

#### ABANDON ALL HOPE OF BENEFIT FROM VOLSTEAD ACT

When we also consider that drunkenness generally has already increased to the preprohibition level, and that drunken children have increased far above what was ever known to be before in our country, we can not escape the conclusion that the Volstead Act is an absolute failure—that it surely has not promoted temperance and sobriety.

Moreover, since conditions have become worse, not better, each year since we have prohibition, and with the "next generation" drinking as never before, there seems to be no hope that the Volstead Act can ever accomplish its purpose.

So much for the effect of prohibition and the Volstead Act on the young folks.

#### DEATHS FROM ALCOHOLISM ON THE INCREASE

But what about the injury wrought by the bootlegger, moonshine, and poison whisky on adults?

We happen to have some statistics on that question.

Figures obtained by the New York World from the United States Census Bureau indicate that the mounting death rate from alcohol, on which the attention of the country was focused sharply at the national convention of State public-health officials held in Washington May, 1927, has not been checked.

Statistics up to December 31, 1926, have been completed for the United States registration area.

They show a picture even more dismal than that unfolded in Washington. There were 4,109 deaths from alcoholism in the United States registration area, which covers nearly all the States, in the last year for which records are available. There were, in addition, 7,591 deaths from cirrhosis—hardening—of the liver, a disease which physicians ordinarily attribute to alcohol.

Starting with 1920, when the reaction from prohibition began to set in, there has been a steadily mounting tide of deaths from these two causes. In virtually every State in the Union, whether known as wet or dry, the percentages have been mounting. There is a general agreement among experts who have studied the subject that the enormous increase in deaths is to be attributed quite as much to the quality of the liquor obtainable as it is to the quantity.

In 1920, two years after the eighteenth amendment was adopted, only 20 persons were recorded in Chicago as dying from alcoholism. In 1927 there were 340 such deaths, an increase of 1,600 per cent for the eight-year period.

Detailed figures showing that the bootlegger is far more deadly than the preprohibition saloonkeeper in his heyday were made public in New York at the bureau of vital statistics of the department of health. The death rate from alcoholism for 1927 is 13 per 100,000, or slightly more than the rate for measles in peak years.

#### BOOTLEGGER FAR MORE DEADLY THAN SALOONKEEPER IN HIS HEYDAY

The figures reveal a startling rise beginning in 1921 and continuing year after year until in 1927 all records for the deadly effects of alcohol, good or bad, are smashed. The 1927 total is, so far as can be learned, the greatest in the history of the city.

The Chicago (Ill.) Journal of January 5 says:

This editorial writes itself. The coroner reports that in 1927 there were in Cook County 433 deaths caused wholly by alcoholism and 161 homicides and deaths by accident clearly due to alcohol. The total, 594, is the ghastly record for 12 months of the Anti-Saloon League and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union brand of prohibition. The number of deaths due to alcoholism is mounting steadily year by year. The "drys" will chant songs in praise of the holy eighteenth amendment and the sacred Volstead Act, but the cemeteries are filling up.

#### IF MY BILL BECAME LAW IT WOULD PREVENT MURDER AND PROMOTE TEMPERANCE

The country evidently can not go on like this.

That is why I introduced my bill to permit the manufacture, sale, and use of light wines and beer.

I am of the firm conviction that if my bill becomes a law—and the Volstead Act is amended accordingly, and also accompanied by suitable revenue legislation—that we would eliminate all the evil effects of the present method of enforcing the eighteenth amendment. And we would also obtain what the eighteenth amendment was passed for—a greater degree of temperance.

My bill, should it become a law, would stop the growth of the bootlegging industry, check disrespect for the Constitution, eliminate scandalous corruption, and prevent murder by poison whisky. And in addition it would produce a handsome revenue which could be used for beneficial purposes.

#### WILL ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE PERMIT OLD PARTIES TO ACCEPT IT?

Let us hope that the Anti-Saloon League—which absolutely controls both the Republican and Democratic Parties in Congress—will permit the committee to report out my bill.

I submit herewith a table showing the number of arrests for intoxication year by year:

Summary of arrests for intoxication  
(Figures from police departments)

	403 places	"Wet" States— 280 places	"Dry" States— 123 places	534 places	602 places
1914	531,574	425,781	105,793		
1915	528,426	413,039	115,387		
1916	563,792	452,029	111,763		
1917	546,351	445,467	100,884		
1918	428,725	358,635	70,090		
1919	312,136	262,301	59,835		
1920	237,101	175,326	61,775	281,561	
1921	321,195	244,656	76,539	376,794	
1922	429,856	329,215	100,671	510,150	
1923	506,104	393,350	112,754	597,201	
1924	521,474	408,034	113,440	612,389	650,961
1925	540,151	423,927	116,224	642,957	687,812
1926	559,074	434,444	124,630	664,101	711,889

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 278. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926;

H. R. 3926. An act for the relief of Joseph Jameson;

H. R. 6487. An act authorizing the Baton Rouge-Mississippi River Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 7009. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7916. An act authorizing the Madison Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Madison, Jefferson County, Ind.; and

H. R. 9186. An act authorizing the Sistersville Ohio River Bridge Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 16, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, February 16, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Navy Department appropriation bill.

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce (H. R. 7940).

## COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND BANKING

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide security for the payment of compensation for personal injuries and death caused by the operation of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia (H. R. 9688).

## COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10 a. m.—caucus room)

To discuss various irrigation projects.

## COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

(10.30 a. m.)

For the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Fourteenth Census (H. R. 27).

For the apportionment of Representatives in Congress (H. R. 130).

## COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the increase of the Naval Establishment (H. R. 7359).

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10 a. m.)

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia (H. J. Res. 18).

## COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to consider House Document 111.

## COMMITTEE ON ROADS

(10 a. m.)

To amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented (H. R. 358, 383, 5518, 7343, and 8832).

To amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post

roads," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and authorizing appropriation of \$150,000,000 per annum for two years (H. R. 7019).

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

366. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary survey of Smith Creek, Md. (H. Doc. No. 177); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

367. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation amounting to \$502,816.88 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1929, together with two proposed amendments affecting estimates of appropriation contained in the Budget for the fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 176); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. YON: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6993. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent certain lands in Louisiana and Mississippi; with amendment (Rept. No. 683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7946. A bill to repeal an act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of the homestead laws to certain lands in the Yellowstone forest reserve," approved March 15, 1906; with amendment (Rept. No. 684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10884. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to carry into effect provisions of the convention between the United States and Great Britain to regulate the level of Lake of the Woods concluded on the 24th day of February, 1925," approved May 22, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. S. 2301. A bill to create a commission to be known as the commission for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 686). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8927. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1918; with amendment (Rept. No. 689). Referred to the House Calendar.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. YON: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 2020. An act for the relief of Leonidas L. Cochran and Rosalie Cochran Brink; without amendment (Rept. No. 687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10932. A bill for the relief of the widows of certain Foreign Service officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10844) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hubbard, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11017) for the prevention and removal of obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in cotton by regulating transactions on cotton futures exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11018) providing for canceling naturalization certificates if and when a naturalized citizen has since the date of the certificate of citizenship been guilty of fraud or by his acts, declarations, or conduct has ceased to be a man of good moral character; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.



By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 11019) to establish a fish-cultural station and auxiliary stations at points in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SINNOTT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 11020) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11021) to amend section 1 of the locomotive boiler inspection law, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 11022) to extend medical and hospital relief to retired officers and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11023) to add certain lands to the Lassen Volcanic National Park in the Sierra Nevada Mountains of the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 11024) to confirm civil annuities granted under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11025) to amend section 202, subdivision 10, of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 11026) to provide for the coordination of the public health activities of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11027) to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of residents of the District of Columbia permanently disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to employment; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 11028) authorizing the coining of silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the memory of Joseph Gurney Cannon; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, favoring Federal aid for maintenance of roads built under the Federal road act; to the Committee on Roads.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing Congress relative to reimbursement by the Government of the United States for moneys paid by the State of Nevada for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 11029) granting a pension to Katharine Grannis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 11030) granting a pension to John Roy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11031) granting an increase of pension to Ellen H. Dilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COMBS: A bill (H. R. 11032) for the relief of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 11033) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 11034) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Matilda Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11035) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Heaton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11036) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Redington; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 11037) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Crosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 11038) granting a pension to Clara E. Andress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11039) for the relief of Jesse Dotts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11040) granting a pension to Mary Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11041) granting a pension to William A. Willburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 11042) for the relief of Ray W. Firth; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 11043) for the relief of Ollie Keeley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11044) granting a pension to Edward Carrier, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 11045) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Clara Percy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11046) granting a pension to Daniel F. Shaser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 11047) granting a pension to James Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 11048) for the relief of Mary L. Ickes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 11049) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hoon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 11050) granting an increase of pension to Curt T. Spicer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11051) granting an increase of pension to Nancy King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 11052) granting an increase of pension to Rosa M. Able; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 11053) for the relief of Hugo Stamm; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 11054) granting a pension to Ada C. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11055) for the relief of persons who furnished labor, material, or money for the construction of the Barling bomber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 11056) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Basil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 11057) granting an increase of pension to Rosena E. Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 11058) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to present former Coxswain Patrick J. Murphy with a distinguished-service medal; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 11059) granting an increase of pension to Alice Sweeney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11060) to correct the military record of James H. Overbaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 11061) granting a pension to Louise Escudero; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11062) granting an increase of pension to Ellen E. Whitmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11063) granting an increase of pension to Nora Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11064) for the relief of F. Stanley Millichamp; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11065) granting a pension to R. G. Rhea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3912. By Mr. BARBOUR: Letters of Sadie C. Reynolds, Lenora Starnes, and Laura L. Foster, of Hughson, Calif., protesting against the naval-expansion program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3913. Also, resolution of Taft Central Labor Union, Taft, Calif., urging that immigration from Mexico be placed upon a quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3914. Also, petition of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, protesting against the Lankford Sunday bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3915. By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition from voters of West Virginia, urging additional relief legislation for Civil War veterans and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3916. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition by clerks employed in the World War division of The Adjutant General's office, favoring the Welch bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3917. Also, petition of Lodge No. 197, of the Order Sons of Italy in America, of New York, favoring resolution introduced by Senator Copeland to proclaim October 12 as Columbus Day for the observance of the anniversary of the discovery of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3918. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of Emma Griffith, Mrs. John Ross, James B. Girard, and 76 other citizens of Madison, Ind., urging the passage of House bill 9588; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3919. By Mr. CARLEY: Petition of the Danish Veterans' Society of New York, Peter Jensen, president, 7012 Perry Terrace, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against reduction of immigrants from Scandinavian countries; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3920. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Ivis Currie, organist, and seven others of Berkeley, Calif., protesting against the passage of the Brookhart bill, relating to the distribution of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3921. Also, petition of Robert Harvey, manager, and several others of Oakland, Calif., protesting against the passage of the Brookhart bill, relating to distribution of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3922. Also, petition of Clarence L. Lewis, theater manager, and six others of Berkeley, Calif., protesting against the passage of the Brookhart bill, relating to the distribution of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3923. Also, petition of Thomas P. Woods and 248 employees of the United States veterans' hospital at Livermore, Calif., urging the passage of House bills 492 and 6518; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3924. By Mr. COHEN: Petition from H. Martinsen and many other constituents, protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3925. By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Petition of Mrs. H. C. Feather and other citizens of Sandy Lake, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation for an increase in pension for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3926. By Mr. COLE of Iowa: Petition of Jonas Olson and 19 other signers, residents of Le Grand, Iowa, petitioning for a pension granting increases to Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3927. Also, petition of Olivia M. Pomeroy and 44 other women signers, residing at Iowa Soldiers' Home, Marshalltown, Iowa, who are widows of Civil War soldiers, petitioning for a bill to be passed granting increase in pension to Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3928. Also, petition of Elvira Stanley, of Whittier, Iowa, and 49 other signers, residents of Whittier and Springville, Iowa, opposing a large naval expansion program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3929. Also, petition of Ole H. Bryngelsam, of Le Grand, Iowa, and 44 other signers, residents of Dunbar, Le Grand, and Gilman, Iowa, being members and others of the Stavanger Monthly Meeting of Friends, believing that war is both unnecessary and un-Christian, that great armies and great navies are not a protection against but rather an incentive to war, protest against any increase of that part of our Navy designed for war purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3930. Also, petition of 356 students and faculty members of Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, believing that the threatened departure in increased naval building is a step in the wrong direction which will lead to competitive building among the nations and eventually to war, oppose the program of increase building proposed by the Committee on Naval Affairs; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3931. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition signed by Stephen M. Ruh and 25 other residents of Elkton, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3932. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of Grace Gibson and other residents of Oneida County, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bills 7179 and 7822 and similar bills for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3933. Also, petition of Mrs. Lou A. Lewis and other citizens of Oneida County, N. Y., protesting against the passage of bills making observance of the Sabbath compulsory; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3934. By Mr. DRANE of Florida: Petition of the Exchange Club of Fort Meade, Fla., urging Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to provide adequate and proper housing for its officers and enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3935. By Mr. EATON: Petition of 55 residents of Bernardsville, N. J., against proposed enactment of compulsory Sunday

observance law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3936. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of citizens of Redding, Calif., protesting against Lankford Sunday closing bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3937. Also, petition of Charlotte Cantrall and other citizens of Alturas, Calif., favoring increase of pensions for veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3938. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Petition of Harry Meyer and other residents of Butte, Mont., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1667, the Brookhart bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3939. Also, petition of H. J. Torrance and other residents of Butte, Mont., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of the Brookhart bill (S. 1667); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3940. Also, petition of Mrs. Ray Nadeau and other residents of Butte, Mont., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1667, the Brookhart bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3941. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of 30 citizens of Kootenai County, Idaho, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3942. By Mr. FULBRIGHT: Petition of citizens of Ava, Douglas County, Mo., urging legislation in behalf of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3943. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Charles E. Anderson, 1406 Columbia Road, South Boston, Mass., urging early and favorable consideration of House bill 5691, to increase the compensation and regulate the leave of absence of storekeepers, gaugers, and storekeeper-gaugers of the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3944. By Mr. GARBER: Letter of L. E. Raymond, manager of the Blackwell Milling & Elevator Co., of Blackwell, Okla., in protest to Senate bill 1752, in regard to the Government printing stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3945. Also, letter of Eugene P. Gum, secretary of Oklahoma Bankers Association, Oklahoma City, Okla., in protest to the passage of Senate bill 1573; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3946. Also, letter of Oklahoma Cottonseed Crushers' Association, of Oklahoma City, Okla., in regard to the control of the boll weevil in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3947. Also, resolution of department of state, Carson City, Nev., asking that Congress give due consideration to enacting Federal aid for maintenance purposes on the same ratio as used for the basis of the present Federal aid road act; to the Committee on Roads.

3948. Also, letter of Herbert S. Foreman, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the enactment of the Fitzgerald bill (H. R. 500) for the retirement of the disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3949. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of residents of Newfane, Vt., opposing legislation to provide for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3950. By Mr. GREEN of Florida: Petition of 104 citizens of Ocala, Fla., advocating passage of bill providing for increase in pensions to Civil War veterans and Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3951. By Mr. GUYER: Petition of 160 citizens of Franklin County, Kans., protesting the enactment of Sunday observance legislation, and particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3952. Also, petition of citizens of Ottawa, Franklin County, Kans., protesting the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3953. Also, petition of 112 citizens of Allen County, Kans., urging an increase of pensions for veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3954. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of residents of Kent and Seattle, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3955. Also, petition of residents of Sequim, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.



3956. Also, petition of a few residents of Port Angeles, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3957. Also, petition of a number of residents of Washington State, protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3958. By Mr. HARRISON: Petition of Thomas Jones and others, of Berryville, Va., opposed to the proposed Navy program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3959. By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of 21 citizens of Northwood, Iowa, urging the passage of a Civil War pension bill for the relief of needy and suffering veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3960. By Mr. KEMP: Petition protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3961. By Mr. KING: Petition of the National Tribune's Civil War pension bill signed by William Rose, Rushville, Ill., and 40 other citizens of my district; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3962. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Edna Abraham and 102 other residents, of Kalamazoo, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3963. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition signed by Henriette C. L. Fedderson, of Neligh, Nebr., pleading for increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of Civil War veterans for the relief of suffering survivors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3964. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Benson, Minn., urging passage of House bill 9588; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3965. Also, petition of members of the Hector (Minn.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring enactment of the Stalker bill (H. R. 9588); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3966. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Minnesota, favoring enactment of Stalker bill (H. R. 9588); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3967. Also, petition of Omar Hanan, of Willmar, Minn., favoring enactment into law of House bills 25, 88, and 89; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3968. Also, petition of Farmers Union, Local No. 99, of Kandiyohi County, Minn., urging an investigation of the strike in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Labor.

3969. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of R. H. Comey Brooklyn Co., protesting against House bill 7759, designed to amend the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3970. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of Rotary Club, Raton, N. Mex., opposing enactment of Box bill restricting Mexican immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3971. Also, petition of citizens of Berino, N. Mex., S. A. Donaldson, chairman, opposing proposed naval program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3972. Also, petition of Parent-Teacher Association of Chamberino, N. Mex., Mrs. J. I. Ware, president, opposing proposed naval-construction program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3973. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the emergency committee of the big Navy bill, Boston, Mass., protesting against the suggested naval building program involving the expenditure of from \$740,000,000 to \$2,500,000,000 during the next 5 to 20 years; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3974. Also, petition of the Women's Committee for Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, opposing the appropriation for the support of the prohibition-enforcement activities of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3975. Also, petition of Peter Henderson & Co., seedsmen, New York City, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 9296, revision of the postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3976. Also, petition of the Board of Young Friends Activities, Poplar Ridge, N. Y., opposing the proposed big Navy bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3977. By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of 1,200 citizens from several counties in the State of New Jersey, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3978. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition against the enactment into law of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78) or any similar measure, signed by J. C. Siemens and a large number of other citizens of Goldfield, Iowa; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3979. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the National Tribune's Civil War pension bill, signed by Mrs. G. K. Demary and 39 other citizens of Medina, N. Y., urging legisla-

tion in behalf of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3980. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Resolutions by the Agricultural Economic Conference at Minot, N. Dak., indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill and further Government support of cooperative marketing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3981. Also, petition of 48 residents of Williston and Epping, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3982. Also, petition of 62 residents of Regent and Beach, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and especially against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3983. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of 14 citizens of the second congressional district of Oregon, protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3984. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Wallowa County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3985. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by Viola G. Wing and 289 others of the State of Washington, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3986. Also, petition signed by John Gustafson and 21 others, of Pomeroy, Wash., urging increase in pensions for veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3987. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of a number of citizens of Greene County, Pa., in support of legislation increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3988. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and more particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3989. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and more particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3990. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Middletown, Ky., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, and more particularly House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3991. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of 302 students and members of the faculty of Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, protesting against the increased building program proposed by the Committee on Naval Affairs; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3992. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution passed by the Middletown monthly meeting of Friends, held February 5, 1928, in opposition to the proposed naval appropriation bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3993. Also, petition from Abington quarterly meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, comprising approximately 1,300 members, in opposition to increasing the naval armaments of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3994. Also, petition with 122 signatures of residents of Montgomery County, Pa., protesting against legislation designed to increase the naval armaments of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, February 16, 1928

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, our Heavenly Father, who hast led us through storm and sunshine, bringing us in safety to the beginning of this day, let Thy love and patience be shown forth in our lives and conversation, Thy tenderness and compassion in our words and actions. For the duties of this day strengthen us with blessings from on high, that through Thine own enabling power whatever of good has been cast down may be raised up, whatever of truth has grown old may be made new, and that all things may advance unto perfection, when the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, February 13, 1928,